THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXXIV.] DECEMBER, 1851. [Vol. VII.

LETTER TO THE AUTHOR OF "THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM."*

My dear W.,

You ask me to give you my thoughts upon your book, "The Creed of Christendom;" and I am the more ready to do this because I am so little satisfied with the remarks of those who have yet written in reply to it. I think your work deserves a better answer than it has received, and I shall consider the learned world wanting in its duty if a better is not put forth. Do not suppose, however, that I am going to exhibit the presumption of attempting to supply the shortcomings of your critics, or of pretending to do that which it appears to me they have *not* done. Your learning must be answered by the learned, and critics must examine your criticism. But as I suppose you write to other men than these, others may perhaps venture to form a judgment on such portions of your book as fall within the reach of ordinary powers, and the knowledge of ordinarily educated men.

I have no thought of following you through the wide field of inquiry and conjecture through which you wander, and in the wilds of which I think your conclusion leaves you, or of tracing step by step your criticism and your line of argument. To do this would require a volume like your own, and powers and knowledge very unlike mine. Moreover, my attention is drawn away from your criticism and your arguments to the vast conclusions which you have built upon them, and to the consideration how far these stand safely and securely on their foundations. It is to this point that I wish to address myself.

And first, let me say generally what points and qualities I like in the book, as I shall perhaps have to speak hereafter of others that I do not like.

1. I like the style of your writing in this, as in most other productions of your prolific pen, because I can understand it. Your language is always plain, pointed, intelligible English. Your modes of thought, too, and illustration and expression, are such as my dull intellect can comprehend: they are clear, simple, strong and significant. I never have to read a sentence twice in order to catch the idea intended to be conveyed in it. I wish I could say the same of the writing of some of your reviewers.

2. I like the cool, business-like, unrelenting way in which you approach the subject,—breaking through the outworks of conventional

* This letter was written without the least idea of publication. This circumstance, it is hoped, will excuse its abrupt and unfinished treatment of the subject, and a personality of address which may perhaps seem out of place in a Review.

and antiquated notions, and the incrustations that ages have gathered round it, and going at once to your mark; stripping the subject of everything that does not really belong to it; calling things by their right names, and insisting upon having ideas attached to words; and not allowing anything to go by without examining its passport, and making it give a good account of itself.

3. I like your impartial and judicial treatment of the subject in the early portion of the work; and the arguments seem to me to be generally fair, the points extremely well put, and the case stated in a clear, full and honest way.

You seem to have come freshly to the subject, as a stranger who has recently met with the Bible, and has been struck with its general reception in the world, and the opinions of men concerning it. This seems to me to be the right way of approaching the argument.

These remarks apply, however, only to the first six chapters; or perhaps I might extend them to the end of the seventh chapter. Thus far I read the book with much interest, and, as far as I remember, with a general agreement. I found, indeed, many points in which I differed from your conclusions; many on which I doubted; many on which I wanted knowledge to form any judgment at all upon them; many on which I began to feel somewhat out of humour at being referred continually to the authority of five or six German critics, whose writings were of course sealed books to me, but very rarely indeed to any English writers on the same subject, in whose works I might have further pursued the inquiry or examined the authority; thereby forcing upon the reader the impression either that there were no English works upon these topics, or that you had never read them, or that they were so utterly frivolous and worthless as not to merit even a passing notice. Many such things I found, and they thickened as I went along; but on the whole I met with much in which I could cordially agree—much that I could relish—much that I admired—much that gave me valuable and interesting information; and still more that was richly suggestive, and calculated to awaken thought, inquiry and speculation.

I should extend the above remarks, on the whole, to the end of your examination of the Gospel of Matthew. But from that point you seem to me to launch at once into deep waters, and very soon to be beyond your soundings. You no longer grasp the subject as if you were master of it. Your style of treating it rapidly deteriorates—your arguments grow weaker—your assertions larger, more unqualified and sweeping—your criticism becomes hypercritical—your manner of handling your topics loses its judicial character, and passes gradually into that of the hostile advocate—you become more apt to draw large inferences from small data, and to found important conclusions upon hasty and inconclusive arguments; and not unfrequently you seem ready to admit in favour of a doubt a degree of evidence which you would at once reject if offered in support of a received opinion or a popular belief.

Your treatment of the apostle John is to me very unsatisfactory: it is harsh and rough. I think you do not appreciate either his character or his writing. Your arguments and criticism, though containing much that is fair and just, in no way support the very large conclusions that you build upon them.

Your chapter on the Resurrection is still worse. The whole handling of the subject seems to me very bad. I think much of what you say was answered long ago by Paley; and if I were to reply to your criticism, it would be by copying a great part of his argument. Yet you never mention that argument, or refer to the existence of the great work that contains it. You surely cannot have read, or must have totally forgotten it. I know not how otherwise to account for your writing on such a subject—almost denying the historical evidence of the most important fact of Christianity—and yet never referring by the slightest word to the remarks and arguments of the most popular English author upon the same question.

But I am at length brought altogether to a stand by an assertion which, taken with its accompaniments, is indeed enough to startle any one who has been accustomed to believe that there *is something* in Christianity. You say that "you do not throw any uncertainty over Christ's history;" and again, that "Christianity, according to your view of it, is unassailable." Yet you make out, or think that you have done so, that there is no sufficient evidence of the resurrection of Jesus (indeed, that it is rather desirable than otherwise that there should not be); that there is no assurance of immortality for ourselves; that the views of Christ regarding a future world were less in advance of his age and country than on any other subject; that there is and can be no efficacy in prayer; that there is and can be no forgiveness of sins; that this world is not a state of preparation for another—not a school for eternity—but our home and resting-place; and that retribution for virtue and vice is sufficiently awarded in this scene of our existence! All this may be so; but what is left of Christianity?

The fact is, that your arguments, and the conclusions you draw from your criticism, carry you much farther than the establishment of the three propositions stated in the Preface, and *really strike at the very root of our religion.* The remnant you have left yourself you may still call by the name of Christianity, but it would not be recognized as such by any considerable body of persons professing the name of Christians, nor do I find in it any of the great distinctive features of that religion. You, therefore, really open again the whole question of the evidences of Christianity; and on this point you have been answered long ago by a host of writers, among whom the names of Locke, Butler, Paley and Channing have usually been thought to carry with them no small weight, though, except in one solitary instance, you never once deign either to notice their arguments or refer even to the existence of their writings. I do not remember that they precisely meet any of your particular objections or propositions, and they probably throughout look at the subject from a different point of view; but, nevertheless, they handle the great question under discussion, and the three first, at least, are still the great authorities upon the subject with a very large proportion of English Christians. I cannot but think that the omission of their names, and of all reference to their writings, is a very grave error in your work. A book written by an Englishman, addressed to Englishmen, and assailing the very foundations of the faith of Englishmen, actually never mentions, except in one solitary instance, either the names or arguments of the greatest, best known and most admired of all English authors who have written upon the

same subject! An English controversial work upon a given topic omits all mention of the most popular English works upon the same controversy!

You seem to me, indeed, in the latter portion of your treatment of the sacred writings, to be so absorbed in the details of the minute criticism you are pursuing, as to have lost all perception of the great prominent features both of the history and the religion of Christianity, as well as of the character of him who gave it being. Now it is on these that you have really put yourself at issue with the Christian world. A humble Jew, the son of a carpenter of Nazareth, changed the religion of half mankind. This is the first fact you have to meet. Can you get over this fact? Can you explain it on any ordinary human principles? That is the question you have mooted, and which, by mooting again, after it has been so often started, and so often, to the satisfaction of most Christian men, been answered and laid aside as settled, you have bound yourself to meet and reply to. You have to consider the origin and the course of our religion,—the effect and the cause,—and to make one adequate to the other. You have to remember where and how it sprang—among whom and at what speed it spread. No worldly power, no sword of conquest, no fanatic madness. The only weapon was the tongue—the only influence was that which breathed from the fervent convictions of the teacher—the only conquests were the hearts and understandings of men. Yet that religion flew like wildfire over the nations. What made it so fly? In short, can you account for its origin, its progress, its reception among men, by any ordinary human means? That, again, is the question. No small criticism can grapple with this matter. You may make what you will of the Gospels;—you may cut away, and carve, and sift, and detect, and compare, and deny; *but there is the religion;* there is the history of it; there is the picture of the great Founder of it. You cannot overturn these. You can only explain how they come there.

Again: What is the second great fact that you have to meet, and which no criticism can overturn? The Founder of that religion died upon the cross. There can be no doubt of this. Very shortly afterwards—probably within a very few days—it was publicly asserted by his disciples that he was risen from the dead; and this, too, on the very spot where he had died—among the very people who had seen him die, and in the face of the very fanatics who had slain him. No one can doubt this. As Paley says, "This would be completely certain, if the Gospels had been lost, or never had been written. Every piece of scripture recognizes the resurrection. Every Epistle of every apostle,—every author contemporary with the apostles, and of the age immediately succeeding the apostles,—every writing from that age to the present, concur in representing the resurrection of Christ as an article of his history, received without doubt or disagreement by all who called themselves Christians, as alleged from the beginning by the propagators of the institution, and alleged as the centre of their testimony. Nothing, surely, that a man himself does not see and hear, can be more certain to him than this point. I do not mean that nothing can be more certain than that Christ rose from the dead, but that nothing can be more certain than that the first teachers of Christianity gave out that he did so." The only question that remains is this—

whether they themselves knowingly published a falsehood, or whether they were themselves deceived—whether either of these suppositions be possible. You incline to the latter of these possibilities. You have no doubt that the disciples believed the fact. Then this belief must be accounted for. Theirs was no ordinary strength of conviction; it was proved by the fire of no ordinary trials. You say that this is the only real evidence we have of the resurrection. Be it so. Is it not enough, if you consider all the circumstances amid which that conviction was formed? Yet you urge all the small critical objections *con amore*, and, as it seems to me, vastly over-estimating their weight, while this great argument for the most important event that ever happened to the human race is rather *admitted* than *cordially welcomed and embraced*. You still say, they may have been deceived; it is even probable they were so. But does the difficulty never strike you, as to *where was the body?* If that was still lying in the sepulchre, how could the disciples believe that it was risen? If it was not there, where was it? If it was removed by the disciples, *there was fraud*. If it was in possession of his enemies, why was it not produced? The production of the body would have at once exposed the imposition, and Christianity would have perished with Christ.

Again: All the great features of the internal evidence seem to me never to attract your notice. It is not enough to say that you did not wish to enter upon this argument—that it is beside your case. You *must* enter upon it, because you assume conclusions at which you cannot possibly arrive but by passing over its dead body. Take, then, the internal evidences of the sacred writings as they now stand, or take one point in those evidences. Take the character of Jesus Christ,—the whole picture presented to us, imperfect and scanty as are the lines of the portrait. Look at it—master it—fix the image on your mind,—and then see whether such a picture can be accounted for by any ordinary human means,—whether there was anything in the times and circumstances among which he lived, to form such a being. If you think, as I suppose you do, that there is nothing in the picture that may not be so accounted for, I can only say that you must either vastly over-estimate the value and weight of the supposed circumstances, or you must have formed what appears to me a most poor and remote appreciation of the great being whose nature and character we are considering. I feel sure that if you saw him as I do,—if he were to you the same being that he is to me,—you would turn away from your theory of his existence, as from a supposition utterly shocking and preposterous. Where such a difference exists as to the terms of the proposition we are discussing,—as to the shape, dimensions and nature of the object we are considering,—as to the form, features and expression of the picture we are both gazing on,—argument is in vain, and even comparison of opinion impossible. *You* see one thing, and I another. You argue about one thing, and I argue about another. Our lines cannot meet.

The argument founded on internal evidence is most ably and briefly handled by Channing in a discourse on the Evidences of Christianity, which was one of his earliest works, and which, without at all touching upon your criticism, appears to me to answer most destructively the conclusions that you found upon it. He takes nothing for granted but

the existence of the Scriptures and of Christianity; he is as free as yourself from the fetters of orthodox or conventional faith; but he looks at a broad subject broadly, grapples with its salient points and its large features, and resolves the whole argument into the very intelligible proposition, that all effects must be produced by causes adequate to their production. You surely never can have read this tract, or must have forgotten its existence.

In your chapter on Miracles, you seem to me to waste a great deal of ingenious argument in endeavouring to prove such points as these,—that no miracles can authenticate any doctrine,—that miracles cannot be the basis of any historical religion,—that those recorded in the New Testament did not produce universal belief, &c. Now, to my mind, all this is quite beside the case. The real question you have to decide upon is this—Did the miracles recorded in the New Testament ever take place? And, if so, did the performance of them prove the possession of any superhuman powers in the individual who performed them? If these questions are answered in the affirmative, all your arguments can prove nothing to the purpose. If they are to be answered in the negative, it must be by the force of some other line of disproof than that you have adopted. Here, again, as in many other parts of the ground you go over, I think you might have found some light by a little consultation with the pages of Paley and Channing. They each, in their own way and by a different mode of statement, shew the grounds on which our belief in these miracles must rest, and also in what essential points many of these differ in their character from all others with which they are liable to be compared. This difference you never notice, and in this, as in so many other portions of your argument, persist in looking at your subject only from one point of view.

And where, after all, lies your real difficulty about admitting the miracles of our early records? You do not think they were impossible, or that there was in the production of such effects any real, inherent or essential difficulty. Is anything more wonderful recorded there than a thousand phenomena we every day behold? To me there is nothing more wonderful in the raising of Lazarus, or even in the resurrection of our Saviour, than in the conception of a child. There is nothing among the miracles of the New Testament more marvellous to my mind than our nightly sleep and our daily waking from it—that suspension of all the powers and faculties of our being but just those necessary for its continuance—that partial death—and then that morning's resurrection.

If, then, the main objection to a belief in miracles lies in this, that they are deviations from the ordinary and known course of nature, we only have to find an occasion or a state of things in which such a deviation might reasonably be expected, or might even be required, and the whole difficulty vanishes. Now *we*, as Christians, say that such an occasion *has* occurred, that such a state of things *has* existed, and that the period and the purpose of the Christian revelation *did require* some such manifestation of superhuman power to attract the careless attention of the multitude, and to prove to them, as *mere spoken truth* never could have done, that he who performed such miracles must indeed have been commissioned from on high. Arrived at this point,

the rest is a mere matter of testimony, and this testimony must be tried as any other testimony must be; and when it is so tried, we hold it to be sufficient to establish the reality of the miracles that rest upon it.

For what are these miracles? They are not momentary and passing miracles, like the appearance of a spectre, or the hearing of a supernatural sound. They are not miracles, the belief of which might have sprung from the exaggeration of some minor fact that really took place. They were not few in number, or confined to one locality, or performed only in presence of select friends and credulous adherents. They were of various kinds, and performed in great variety of situation, form and manner,—in town and country, in synagogues and private houses, in the street and in the highway,—sometimes with preparation, as in the case of Lazarus,—sometimes by accident, as in the case of the widow's son at Nain,—when attended by multitudes, and when alone with the patient,—in the midst of his disciples, and in the presence of his enemies,—with the common people around him, and before the Scribes and Pharisees and rulers of the synagogues.

Again: they were generally of a broad and palpable character, about which there could be no mistake. A man known to have been born blind is restored to sight. The sight remains; he continues to see; he does not vanish and hide himself from examination; on the contrary, he is forthcoming, there and then, to answer the call, to satisfy the scrutiny, to sustain the browbeating, of the angry and powerful enemies of his beneficent restorer. A lame man, known as such by all the frequenters of the temple, is commanded by the passing apostles to rise up and walk. He does so; and instead of relapsing into his lameness, or disappearing from the city, he goes boldly and joyfully into the temple, holding his deliverers by the hand, calling upon them the attention of the people, and walking and leaping and praising God. And when, on the next day, the apostles are brought before the Jewish council, the grateful man is with them to bear testimony to his cure, and to repeat his gratitude to those who had so wonderfully healed him. Again, Lazarus is called from the tomb: a great number of witnesses are present, both disciples and unbelievers. What are the circumstances of this resurrection? The dead man does not merely revive and come forth, and speak and die again, nor does he go away and disappear from the gaze of men; but he returns to his home and family, and there remains: for we find him some time afterwards in the same town, sitting at table with Jesus and his sisters, visited by great multitudes of the Jews as an object of curiosity, and giving by his presence so much uneasiness to the Jewish rulers as to suggest to them the propriety of destroying him.

Such are examples of many of the miracles recorded in the Sacred Writings; and we maintain that they are events of so broad and unmistakeable a character as to be utterly inexplicable by any supposition of delusion in the witnesses or of exaggeration in the narrators.

Then, again, who and what kind of person was it that did all these wonderful works? It was a person more wonderful than they. It was not the case of an ordinary person performing extraordinary things. His character and bearing are like his words and his works. Christ himself is the greatest miracle of the Christian story.

These are what seem to me to be some of the broad, salient features of the question; yet all these you pass entirely by, as if you had not observed them, or as if you thought them beside your purpose, or as if you deemed them unworthy of your notice.

You seem to me also to be inconsistent with yourself. You apply the square and rule of logic most unrelentingly in your treatment of the greatest part of the subject; but when it lands you in a conclusion from which your very nature revolts, you at once throw it overboard, without hesitation or remorse, simply telling it that its reign is ended—that its jurisdiction is passed—that its decisions can be reversed by appeal to a superior court—and that whatever may be its supposed power, there are things yet stronger than itself! Why not start with this declaration instead of concluding with it? In seeking for proofs of our immortality, and finding none in the resources of logic, you fall back upon the natural instincts of the soul. Be it so. The reader of the earlier portions of your work is naturally somewhat surprised to find you suddenly retiring on this line of retreat. But let it be agreed that these instincts, though affording rather a vague and unsafe foundation for a creed, and somewhat difficult to define and limit, may nevertheless often point to the truth we seek more surely as well as more shortly than the precise formulæ of argument,—how can you avoid the next question that starts up before you in the path? May not this inward light throw some ray of illumination on other dark points of the great theme we are pursuing? On what principle can you apply this test of truth to one question, and refuse its application to any other? Shall the soul light us on our way to immortality, and not guide us also to the feet of our Father in heaven—not open our lips in prayer—not prompt us irresistibly to pour forth our wants, our supplications, our sighings, our groanings, the sharp cry of our spirit's agony, before Him who breathed us into being, and to whom the living spirit within us rises as naturally as the smoke of the wood upon the altar mounts upwards into the still air of heaven? Is the soul, again, to be forbidden to look upon the character and nature of Jesus, and to assist, at least, in the interpretation of both? And may it not perceive in it a truth, an unearthly beauty, a supernatural grandeur, which logic cannot define, nor language describe, nor argument prove? Who shall decide to what questions this mode of inquiry may be applied, and to which it is inapplicable? The ear of one man shall listen for that inward voice, and another shall turn away from its suggestions as dangerous and delusive. Who shall say that truth may not be conveyed as surely to the first by those silent breathings or those strong instincts that carry conviction to his soul, he knows hardly *how*,—as to the second it may find entrance only by the prescribed terms of logical proof. But I think this admission should be stated at the outset, or the argument carried on on the understanding that this difficulty in determining the precise bounds of Logic's jurisdiction is throughout felt and acknowledged.

In concluding this bundle of desultory remark, there is one question that I should like to propose to you, which I think all objectors to the existing evidences of Christianity are almost bound to consider well before they reject the proof they *have*, and persist in demanding some other which they have not. Supposing that all these events really did

take place as they are related in our Scripture story,—that the history is, in all the great facts and important features of it, a faithful and true one,—what is the kind and degree of evidence concerning it that would naturally have come down to us? Would it have been an unbroken chain of unassailable proof, such as would satisfy a jury of logicians, each separate fact alleged being supported by such an overwhelming weight of evidence as must force conviction on any reasonable understanding? Is this the kind of proof that would have been handed down to our times, and to which we could have appealed triumphantly in all our controversy with unbelievers? Would not such a chain of evidence—so complete, so irrefragable—have been, from its very completeness, evidence of the most suspicious kind? On the other hand, would not the evidence that would naturally remain and be available for our belief, be very much the same, both in kind and in degree, with that which we do now actually possess? Or, to put the question in another way—Can you conceive of any degree of evidence much greater than that we now have, that would not be too great; that would not prove too much, and throw a strong suspicion over its truth and genuineness?

You cannot fairly refuse to receive the evidence that is offered, if the case, from the very nature of it, does not admit of more; or if it does not admit of any better; or if any evidence much more complete would, from that very completeness, raise a suspicion of its honesty. Nor, I think, can a sincere inquirer, ready to face every difficulty—to listen to every objection—to look at his subject from every point of view, and to examine it on all sides—avoid meeting this question, or decline to test his argument by thus turning back upon his steps, and reading it, as it were, the other way.

One word more, and I have done. There are two circumstances that appear to me very observable in the works or arguments of sceptical writers—not confined, indeed, by any means, to the field of religious controversy—and which I have especially remarked in your book, as well as in Newman's "Phases of Faith." The first is this—that one great difference between these men and others is not that their credulity is less, but only that it takes another line; not that their power of digesting the marvellous is weaker, but only that they feed on another variety of marvel. The particular proposition they are combating—the individual fact they are bent on disproving—no argument, no attainable evidence, can induce them to admit. But in their eagerness to overthrow the enemy, they find no difficulty in receiving any other supposition, explanation or possible conjecture, that may support their view of the case, no matter how monstrous or improbable it may appear to others, or how little supported by positive evidence of any kind. Take any shape but *that*, and nothing is too gigantic, no contrivance too ingenious, no possibility too remote, to be admitted.

The other point that strikes me much in such writings as yours, is this—that after you have cut away and overthrown and destroyed, and after you have narrowed your creed to a mere nucleus of faith, and left yourself only a few first principles to lean upon, you have not thereby escaped from the region of difficulty and darkness. You still are surrounded by these, as other men are surrounded by them. Probability has not become certainty, nor has darkness become light. The points

of belief you hold are perhaps as hard of explanation as those which you reject. The dark enigma of life you have not solved, nor have you sensibly lessened the number or the weight of the many perplexing inquiries that are continually suggesting themselves to those who seek to pass the veil that hangs over the Invisible.

Yes, there is yet one other consideration I must urge on your attention: I cannot pass it by, though it is a solemn and a painful one. I must again remind you that your book is not merely a critical survey of some portions of the Sacred Volume, nor even an attempt to prove that many views of modern orthodox Christianity were never held by Christ. But you have proceeded beyond this purpose to strike at the very foundations of our faith: you have cut away from it all its characteristic features—all that distinguishes it from the other religions of the world—all that gives it vitality and meaning—and have left us little more than a dry and barren chronicle of a somewhat important event, and a scanty memoir of a somewhat extraordinary man. Yet what is Christianity? It has existed through all political and social changes, through the convulsions of continents, the decay of empires, the destruction of nations, the deluge of barbarism, the revolutions of science, for eighteen hundred years. During the greatest portion of that period, it has been the religion of nearly the whole of the civilized world; the greatest and best of men have been among its disciples; millions have walked in its light and have died in its hope. What is it now? It is still the religion of the civilized world. It is the religion of our home and country. Every village church is a monument erected by its worshipers. In every cottage is a Book containing the record of its story. The poor are feeding on its heavenly hopes; thousands languishing on the bed of pain are drawing patience and consolation from its promises; thousands of broken hearts have no other staff to lean upon; thousands of weeping eyes are lifted towards that heaven which is their Saviour's dwelling-place, in the firm and joyful belief that where he is, there also one day will his servants be. And why do they believe this? Not because the blind instincts of their nature tell them so—not because logic allows it—not because the wise and learned of the earth make out that it may or must be even thus, but because it is *there:* they open the book, and *it is there:* there is the record of their story—there is the picture of their Redeemer—there are the words of his promise—there are the grounds of their hope, of their trust, of their consolation. This is Christianity; and he who seeks to overthrow Christianity must tear all this out of the hearts, the bleeding hearts, of millions of his fellow-men. What an awful responsibility does that man take upon himself who sets before him such a work as this! Consider the real nature of it; consider the consequences that may follow even the most partial success of his endeavours. Shake a man's belief in all that he has been accustomed to lean upon for support, for guidance, for consolation,—which he has looked up to for light, which has brightened his future, and to which he has trusted as a refuge when his dark hour draws near,—and what have you done? What meed of gratitude have you earned from him whose tottering feet you have overthrown, whose way you have darkened, whose light you have extinguished?—"But," you will say, "truth is truth, and must be proclaimed on the house-tops; and whatever be the consequence of its admission

and its announcement, *that consequence must be met;* and cannot, whatever be its complexion, destroy the parent truth from which it legitimately sprung." Granted;—though he who demands an unfaltering assent to this awful proposition, and he who yields it, should alike tremble as they do so. But here interposes this very essential point in the case before us, viz., that truth, and your view of truth, may possibly not be identical. What then? If you still feel compelled by the spirit within you to put forward your view of truth, it ought at least to be done under a most strong and solemn consciousness of the above possibility, viz., that you share the liability to error of our common nature, and that no divine aid or illumination has been granted to your inquiries that has been denied to the investigations of your fellow-men. In then approaching such a task, you are bound, under responsibility the most serious, to make yourself, in the first place, thoroughly master of the great theme you are about to handle. You are bound to look upon it on every side. You are farther bound to present every side of it to your readers. All your authorities are not to be drawn from one school of critical theologians—all your arguments are not to be on one side of the question; you must hold the beam even, and give full and honest weight to every matter that is put into either scale. Your object is not to destroy an enemy or to overthrow an antagonist, but to ascertain and set forth the whole of a mighty truth,—a truth linked with all our hopes of happiness, with all that is great and holy and enduring in our nature.—A man who undertakes the task that you have undertaken, should at the commencement most seriously ask himself the question—"Can I do all this?" And when he has finished his work, and looks upon the labour of his hands, he should ask, "Have I done all this?"

But it is time to conclude.

Believe me ever yours very affectionately,

S. G.

W. R. Greg, Esq., the Craig, Windermere.

MR. YATES ON THE BITTER APPLES OF SODOM.

Sir,

I beg to add the following remarks to the observations of a learned correspondent in your last Number (p. 577).

The subject of the bitter apples of Sodom is treated to a certain extent in a satisfactory manner by A. B. Lambert, Esq., late Vice-President of the Linnæan Society, in the seventeenth volume of the Transactions of that Society.

In the year 1835, or shortly before that time, the Dead Sea was visited by the Hon. Robert Curzon, to whose enterprize and activity we are in a great measure indebted for the acquisition of the most valuable collection of Syriac MSS. which is anywhere to be found, and which is now preserved in the British Museum. On the mountains in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea this gentleman found a tree growing in abundance, which was about the size of our apple-tree, and which

was found on examination to be the Quercus Infectoria of Linnæus. It is in fact the same species of oak which produces the galls of commerce. In this situation, however, the galls, or oak-apples, differ from those of commerce both in appearance and in the circumstance that they are produced by a different insect. "Mr. Curzon informs me these galls when on the tree are of a rich purple, and varnished over with a soft substance of the consistence of honey, shining with a most brilliant lustre in the sun, which makes the galls appear like a most delicious and tempting fruit. Having had the curiosity to taste a small quantity of the interior of one, I found it the strongest of bitters, and that it may truly be said of it, 'as bitter as gall.'" (Lambert *in Linn. Tr.*, XVII. 445.) The gall is somewhat pear-shaped and of the size of a small apple or pear.

Mr. Conder, in his "Modern Traveller," having given a full account of all the previous speculations on the subject, anticipates in the following remarkable terms the discovery of Mr. Curzon: "It is possible, indeed, that what Tacitus and Josephus describe may have originated, like the oak-galls in this country, in the work of some insect; for these remarkable productions sometimes acquire a considerable size and beauty of colour."

Mr. Lambert supposed the oak-apple discovered by Curzon to be identical with the galls of commerce. The question was, however, examined by that distinguished entomologist, Mr. Westwood, and his observations were published A.D. 1838, with a full exposition of the whole matter by the late Mr. Loudon in his *Arboretum et Fruticetum Britannicum*, Vol. III. pp. 1931-2. Westwood found the insect to be different from that of the common gall, and he confirms his own observation by the testimony of Olivier, who, when he visited the country, saw and described these apples, but without suspecting them to be the "far-famed apples of Sodom." Probably he visited the Dead Sea when the brightness of their colour had faded; but he describes them as "very light and of a spongy substance."

I have only to add, that engraved representations of the apples observed by Mr. Curzon are given (*ll. cc.*) by Olivier, Lambert and Loudon. That in the Linnæan Transactions is beautifully coloured.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES YATES.

Highgate, Oct. 31, 1851.

FREE INQUIRY.

MANLY inquiries are high and honest exercisings of the conscience and heart; painful and toilsome they may be, but the issue is a happy childly sureness. The childish, who inquire not, rebuke the doubt and debate of sincere inquirers, urging them to become as babes; yet themselves may be far less babes than the men they rebuke. Arrogant for ignorance such often shew themselves, with a most unchildly scorn; while they who say earnestly, What is Truth? may already be the more childly for their questioning, and are on the way to childly faith and sureness. The young man's doubt may be but the child's faith dying to grow.—T. LYNCH.

AMERICAN SLAVERY. No. V.

Sir,

From Nashville, Tennesee, I proceeded by steamer to St. Louis, Missouri. I retain vivid recollections of the grandeur and beauty which surrounded me;—the great flood on the Cumberland river, spreading through the trees and over ruined dwellings as far as the eye could reach; the junction of those magnificent streams, the Ohio and Mississippi, which I saw at dawn and sunrise; and the starlight scene which presented itself to me on the following night, as I paced the roof, so to speak, in solitude. Physically speaking, however, the voyage was not very comfortable; for the vessel was unusually crowded with a large party of emigrants to California, and a host of Methodist clergy, including two bishops whom I had met before, who were going to a Conference at St. Louis. As all the state-rooms were full, I had to consider myself fortunate in securing for about five hours each night a mattrass, with my carpet bag for pillow, on a table in the close saloon: the floor was strewed with emigrants and clergy. My mint-and-anise friends, who would not on any consideration travel in a stage-coach on Sunday, found themselves in this steam-boat. However, they had service on board, and stopped at Paducah, at the mouth of the river Tennesee, to preach to the people there: both sermons were interesting. At an hotel at Paducah, I saw a slave punished: as we know how common an event this is, I was fortunate in not seeing it in any other instance. As I passed through the passage, I found the landlady striking a coloured waiter. It was dusk; but from the sound, I do not suppose that she inflicted much bodily pain; but the feeling of personal indignity made my blood boil. She evidently was not ashamed of herself:—Her yellow boy was a smart fellow, but had been enticed by the yellow boy who kept the bar in the steamer, and had been made drunk: the boy was honest, and worth his weight in gold when sober; but she would sell him for 800 dollars, though he would fetch 1000 dollars at New Orleans, &c. Thus a man is first treated like a child or a beast; then he makes a beast of himself, and then is treated so again. The only other occasion during my travels in which I witnessed blows, was on board an American ship, in my voyage home, when they were inflicted on white, and therefore "free and enlightened," American citizens: the cause here also was drunkenness. I saw men handcuffed: one (for another cause) retained in a filthy state from day to day: I heard the most horrid oaths and furious vituperation: blood was shed upon the deck in a fray, and a formal flogging was expected.* Never had I felt before in such an atmosphere of tyranny, from which it was impossible to escape; but then the limit of it was brief, and there was, if needful, a subsequent appeal to law: whilst slavery has no justice and no hopes.

It was a good opportunity for learning the feelings of the Southern clergy, for these Episcopal Methodists belonged to the slaveholding section; though, as I have since learnt, the division did not take place

* The Americans have now set us a good example in abolishing flogging in the navy; and the law, I believe, extends to merchantmen.

on the general question, but as to whether it was expedient that *bishops* should be slaveholders. One of the Northern bishops sided with the South; whilst about 4000 slaveholders, 27,000 slaves, and their clergy, are said to remain with the Northern branch. I had some interesting conversation with the minister who preached at Paducah. He was a slaveholder, and said that he could not justify it to his conscience to be otherwise: the law prevented him from setting his slaves free,* and to sell them to another would be to do away with the means he had of improving their condition. He owned that there were great evils in the system: one of the greatest was the want of sanctity in the marriage tie. The law did not recognize it—the church of course did; but he could not make the slaves pledge themselves to be constant till death do them part. I asked whether he would consider a Christian Negro at liberty to marry again, if removed from his wife beyond his power to see her again? He said that this was a painful question, on which he did not wish to pass judgment. Worldly, selfish men might sell the husband and wife apart, but it was deemed discreditable and wrong: sometimes the husband or wife would prefer remaining where they were, to going with their partner into a new service. As to the mixture of the races, he thought there was a divine law against it. I said that there was no revealed law, and that if it was a law of nature merely we need not interfere, but let nature take care of itself. He saw an improvement in the coloured race: there was still a great deal of immorality among them, part of which must be attributed to their position; still he had met with instances of the most exalted virtue. He spoke of their ill-treatment by some of those who were zealous against slavery. When he was at New York, many of his Northern brethren would not venture to lose caste, as they thought it, by preaching at the African church; whilst he willingly did it, to their surprise, though greatly fatigued by two other services.

St. Louis, as its name imports, was a French town, but most of the old buildings have been burnt down. Its rapid growth is wonderful. I first stopped at the Missouri Hotel, at which W. W. Brown was once a slave. The servants there seemed principally white: the Irish are superseding the slaves in many places. I afterwards spent a few days with a hospitable New-Englander. The Rev. W. Eliot was unfortunately from home. By his untiring zeal, aided by the remarkable increase of the place, the handful of persons with whom he commenced worship here has swelled into one of the largest Unitarian congregations in the Union. They have sold their church for 26,000 dollars, and were building another to cost about 60,000. Mr. Eliot has resided here longer than any other minister, and has exerted a very beneficial influence in the city: he was appointed President of the Board of Education. Dickens, in his "Notes," speaks of him with respect. He has been charged with being a slaveholder. As I was informed, his pity was greatly moved by a young woman who was to be sold; he purchased her, and enabled her to earn her freedom. If he had selfishly

* Unless, indeed, he forced them into exile. I was glad in cases like this to quote the example of Dr. Gilman. The evil is to have slaves at all: from the first injustice spring many more. Frequently the possession is an inherited curse; sometimes it is even prompted by an imperfect kindness.

refrained from having anything to do with her, he might have preserved his anti-slavery reputation untarnished. In Missouri, the white population is to the black as 6 to 1, and therefore there is not the fanaticism and terror which prevail in South Carolina, e. g. The subject is openly discussed. Mr. Eliot is well known there to be opposed to slavery. He frequently adverts to the topic; and by dwelling on great principles, he has the sympathy of most of his congregation against it.

I preached in the morning of May 5th. In the afternoon there was a Lord-Supper service, which was administered by Mr. Hassell, formerly an English Methodist, Mr. E.'s colleague; and in the evening the pulpit, in common with those of other denominations, was occupied by one of the Methodist Conference. (I have preached twice in a Methodist church in Pennsylvania, though known to be a Unitarian.) On the previous week I had looked in at their meeting. One of the body was proposing that the laity should be represented: they had thought it very hard that the church should be split on the slavery question, without their being permitted to utter a word. Still he feared that, if they were admitted to the Conference, the same men might be appointed whose influence procured them civil promotions, such as senators and representatives; and this would virtually make the Conference a union of Church and State, which was undesirable. The discussion was postponed, many of the brethren thinking it a pity to put such thoughts into the heads of the laity. The cholera broke out whilst I was there, and one of the ministers, who had been my fellow-passenger, died of it. As the population had been decimated the year before, some 6000 having been carried off by it, a gloom was cast over everything. The disease, however, subsided.

I proceeded up the Mississippi as far as Alton, Illinois, in order to see the confluence of the Missouri, and afterwards went to Cincinnati, spending a day on my way at Louisville, Kentucky. Our minister there is the Rev. J. H. Heywood, who seems peculiarly devoted to his holy duties, especially to the young and the afflicted. He cannot have the same loathing of slavery which some cherish, or he could not endure a life in such close contact with it. It appeared to me, however, that he was doing more, than many who declaim against it at a distance, to mitigate its horrors and prepare for its subversion. He avails himself of the comparative freedom of discussion which prevails in parts of Kentucky, to publish a little periodical called "The Louisville Examiner," which contains papers favourable to liberty. He gave me the number for the month (May, 1850), the leading article of which is entitled, "Know one Another and be Just." He shews that Northerners cannot regard slavery with too great aversion, as it is "a system, not accidentally, but inherently, corrupt and wrong;" but that they are unjust in regarding slaveholders without discrimination as embodiments of the system; and are often so mistaken as to the actual condition of many of the slaves,* that it causes a revulsion of feeling when they come among

* Whilst writing this article, I see that a Free-soiler from Kentucky says at Boston that "the 200,000 slaves of Kentucky might be, and probably are, better clothed and fed than an equal number of the poorest whites of the same State; yet there was not one of those whites that would change places with one of those slaves. The existence of slavery was a great moral and civil evil to the whites, and was dragging the State down to ruin."

them. On the other hand, hereditary slaveholders who are kind to their Negroes lose sight of those essential evils of the system which they would see clearly if they were taken out of it, and unjustly regard the Northerners as meddlesome fanatics or political knaves. "Let the inhabitants of the different portions of our land," he concludes, "understand each other well; let them come up together to the solution of the great problem of our country and our age, in the spirit of brotherhood, and with a determination to be just one to another, and all to be just to the slave, and the problem would speedily be solved. To remove the dark mountain of slavery which now obstructs our country's path to true greatness and glory, seems a formidable, a disheartening undertaking; but to a nation with boundless resources, and strong in its allegiance to duty and God, nothing is impossible. To the spirit which loyalty to heaven makes brave and strong, the right is always practicable." This number also contains W. Pinckney's denunciation of slavery.

On May 11, I landed at Cincinnati, and found myself once more on nominal free soil.

When I was discussing slavery with a Southern clergyman, on board the *Sarah Sands* from Liverpool, I jocosely said, that before I visited the Southern States I might find it convenient to tar and feather myself, as I could probably do it more to my own satisfaction than his countrymen could do it for me. He assured me, however, that I could travel without risk; and I am bound to say that I never felt any apprehension either of violence or insult. (This was my experience through the whole of my travels in America, over about 13,000 miles, though I was often thrown into very rough company.) But then I seldom mixed in private life among persons who would be guilty of violence; and as I was not travelling as an agent of any society, or even as a missionary, but as an observer, I rarely volunteered remarks on the subject, though I was glad of those opportunities for expressing my sentiments which the remarks of others occasioned. What would be cautious reserve with us, was bold outspeaking in the land of despotism! As an English traveller, I was probably allowed greater freedom of speech than would be tolerated in an American; because we are recognized opponents of slavery, and have shewn our honest aversion to it by our sacrifices. It would be a sort of treason to our country to defend slavery; whilst unless an American consents to it, he is regarded as a traitor to the Union. My appearance indicated my origin, and I found strangers not unwilling to know what I thought of their institution. As facts can be mentioned where opinions might be invidious, I more than once found the advantage of being able to state how respectfully Douglass had been received in England, and that he had been a guest of my own. Once, for instance, I had some conversation with a well-educated Southerner, whom I met on the borders of Georgia, at an inn. He dilated on the kindness shewn to slaves, and asked my opinion. I told him that he need not inquire it, for I was an Englishman. When he pressed me, however, I said that I was disposed to believe that there were few better-fed peasantries anywhere. I was a second Daniel! But then came my fundamental objection,—that they made it a crime to seek what it was a sin for a man not to seek—liberty and education. He then found that the English could

not understand their institutions! He was half amused, half surprised, on hearing of the friendly equality on which I had been with coloured people in England.* It was now my turn to say that the Americans could not understand our institutions, and that he could probably scarce conceive the astonishment of England if the South actually left the Union on the ground that it, a republic, thought slavery essential.

As the opponents of the system dwell exclusively on the dark side, its supporters are anxious to represent favourable exceptions as general rules. I heard a great deal of the care which masters and mistresses often take of their slaves. In cases of illness the family physician was called in, and ladies watched by the sick bed. As we know that persons are usually ready to preserve their property, I do not see that this need be disputed. I heard Southerners boast that if they fought against the North, their slaves would fight for them. As English slaves fight, if called on, against their old companions, and even their kindred, this may be also granted. I heard that they are frequently treated with kindness—so are dogs and cats;—that they are regarded as members of the family—those must have base souls indeed who are willing to regard the members of their family as slaves! And this state of things is precarious: let the slave be successful, often with no little falseness and flattery, in retaining a kindness which is based on no sense of justice, and which depends on caprice—an angry creditor comes, or that cold but inexorable one, Death; and the pet of the family may be sold, like the spaniel, to some harsh, brutal tyrant. Slaves may acquire property: good-natured planters allow them ground for their own culture: wise ones have found the stimulus of hope more powerful than that of fear (it were well if the wise were not the rare exceptions; for the more this truth is learnt, the nearer will be the day of freedom): and occasionally those whose labour is hired out, have the opportunity of earning something for themselves. A Northern acquaintance, whom I met in the South, told me that in a steamer in Georgia he found the steersman and his sons both slaves. One grieves that a steersman should be a slave, but is glad that a slave should be a steersman; for the steersmen on the American boats have superior accommodations, and of course such an office is one of great trust. They were very intelligent men, and their master hired them out for 60 dollars a month, of which he gave them 30; or 29*s.* a week. A Tenneseean allowed to me that many blacks were very intelligent: his father had a slave of great practical sagacity, who was consulted about everything, and, as he had saved a good deal of money, was quite an important personage among the poor whites. He did not care to buy his freedom, as he thought that he was best off as he was. But in all these cases, I am not aware that if the master chose to rob the slave of his money, there would be any redress: certainly, if there was, it would be straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel. It is no recommendation of slavery that some of its victims are better than some who grow up

* One young man asked me how I should like a sister of mine to marry a coloured person?—for his part, he would rather shoot his, than that such a thing should happen! I replied that there were a great many persons, even in my own country, for whom I desired equal rights, whom I did not desire as brothers-in-law, but I supposed that I should be ready to receive as such any one whom a sister should accept as a husband.

under other wrong systems. Those of us who hate war and fagging, may allow that there are men and boys so bad, that they have been improved by the tyrannical discipline that brutalizes others; but it remains to be proved that they could not be improved in a better way. The toiling Negro is a more respectable character than the mean beggar, or the lazerone, or the lazy savage who throws all the toil upon his wife; but this is no proof that the Negro will necessarily relapse into sloth, or that compulsion is the only stimulus to industry. Those who defend slavery for the slave's sake, assume the responsibility of his present artificial condition with all its atrocities.

Since my return, I have read over the portion of Dr. Channing's Memoirs which relates to this subject, and have been struck with perceiving how fully I can sympathize in his views. Did space allow, I might attempt to describe the general effect produced upon me by my tour; but perhaps you will draw your own inferences from what I have already said.

It remains that I say a little of what I observed in the Northern States. It cannot be denied that if all the Northerners were firm and consistent lovers of freedom, the days of slavery would be numbered. The frontier States would find it impossible to preserve their peculiar institution, if the coloured race were treated as brethren across the border. But now the moral influence of the Northerners is blighted: whenever they declaim about freedom, the condition of the Negroes in their midst is not unnaturally retorted against them. The liberty of some of the States is of a very selfish character: coloured persons are not allowed to settle in them; so that their declamations arise rather from republican pride, than from a feeling of justice and humanity. In other States they are treated with very great hardship and indignity; and whilst the coloured race in slavery has been rapidly increasing, that in freedom in the North has actually declined. This, however, may be an argument against the cruelty of exiling manumitted slaves to a climate which is unfavourable to them. The coloured people in the North are either fugitives or freed men, or their descendants, or the descendants of those who had been slaves in the States which are now free. The fugitives are probably of two characters—either persons who have been quickened to flight by an uncontrollable yearning for liberty, or those who are rather moved by the practical hardships of slavery than by any lofty aspirations, and perhaps dread punishment for some offences—if there can be offence where there is no law. The first class we respect as heroes; the last we pity for their sufferings. The first come ready to toil; the last seek rest. The first have the souls of freemen, and all who are free will welcome them; the others shew the degrading influence of their past bondage. The States which open their portals to all the refuse of Europe, as well as to its noble unfortunates, look with morbid horror on the dark stain caused by some few thousand men who have had energy enough to break their chains. Since I left, the coloured people have been the object of greater uneasiness than ever. They, rather than their tyrants, are regarded as the source of all the woe, the causers of the offence. The injured are hated; and some petulantly wish that they could be driven back to the South—better still to Africa—anywhere out of their sight! I believe that we are somewhat chargeable with an analogous

perversity. Many men, who were very indignant at the wrongs of the Irish peasantry, were no less anxious that those who were broken down by these wrongs should not settle down among us. Scores were sent back to the scenes of starvation: and lovers of liberty and equal rights have been so tired of the "wrongs of Ireland," that, half in jest, half in despairing earnest, they have said that the best way of curing them would be to submerse that "gem of the sea" for some twenty minutes. A similar barbarous emotion does the sight of Negroes arouse in many American bosoms. I learnt, however, that, as a general rule, they are better treated and are improving in their condition. I have before mentioned, p. 491, that the day before I landed at Cincinnati, a fugitive slave had been carried off. He was a barber, and had been living for some time at Cincinnati undisturbed: a band of Kentuckians, however, armed with bowie knives, seized him in the public streets at midday, defying the crowd who attempted to rescue him; and, hurraing, hurried him off by the ferry boat to the Kentuckian shore. I was told that ten years ago nothing would have been thought of it. Now it created great excitement: the papers boasted that the exchange was on the whole in favour of freedom; for eight slaves had been smuggled from Kentucky to Ohio on the same day. I heard some burning words from the Presbyterian preacher the next Sunday morning,* who announced that he should preach on the subject in the evening.†

I had some conversation with a black hairdresser, a man of substance, whose son went to the Oberlin Institute, for which a collection was made in this country about ten years ago. My brother, P. P. Carpenter, had charged me with a packet for it, which I left here. It is said to be very free from a sectarian spirit. There are about 300 pupils, about 30 or 40 of whom are coloured, and are received on a footing of equality.

I was acquainted with very few coloured people in the North, but when visiting Rochester, N. Y., on my first journey to Niagara, I made

---

* The Unitarian church was closed for repairs. I arrived on the Saturday, and was not expected. Some kind friends to whom I had been introduced insisted on my leaving the hotel for their very hospitable house, and on Sunday evening I preached at the New Jerusalem church to as many of the Unitarians as could be collected at a few hours' notice. The Rev. A. A. Livermore, whose Commentaries are well known among us, and whom I had previously visited at Keene, N. H., arrived in the course of the following week. The congregation were fortunate in securing such a successor to the lamented Rev. J. H. Perkins. Dr. Ephraim Peabody and Mr. W. H. Channing had been ministers here. I retain extremely agreeable recollections of my visit to Cincinnati.

† The following table, from the Official Census Returns of Aug. 1851, will be interesting to your readers.

Table of Fugitives and Manumitted Slaves from the Southern States during the Year ending June 1, 1850.

States.	Fugitives.	Manumitted.	States.	Fugitives.	Manumitted.
Delaware	19	174	Mississippi	49	11
Maryland	249	483	Louisiana	79	96
Virginia	89	211	Texas	33	5
N. Carolina	57	2	Kentucky	143	164
S. Carolina	14	2	Tennesee	69	40
Georgia	91	30	Missouri	59	54
Florida	16	22	Arkansas	11	6
Alabama	32	14	Dist. Columbia	7	
Total				1017	1314

a point of calling on F. Douglass. (It was a little indication of the way in which they are viewed, that in the City Directory they occupied a separate part of the book. They seemed mostly cooks, waiters, barbers, &c.) He resides at a neat house in the suburbs, which cost him about £400. Unfortunately, he was out of town: however, I found Mrs. Douglas and her sister, who are of a darker hue than he is, and his young family. They asked me to remain to tea, and we had much to converse about. It was a curious combination of the familiar and the strange. It was the first time that I had seen a Negro family, yet I saw one of my sister's pictures over the mantel-piece, and many reminiscences of England. They had not the same acquaintance among the whites as at Lynn, Mass., where they before resided; and the coloured people were more illiterate. Mrs. D. did not seem, I thought, very intimate with them. She complained much of the difficulty of providing her children with a good education. It was an interesting visit. In the following December, in New England, I heard my name cordially uttered at full length in a railway car, and Douglass presented himself to me. A minister who was with me gave him his seat; so we sat together and had a good deal of conversation. He was rather afraid lest his English friends should be set against him by his desire to occupy a position independent of the Garrisonians. He regretted that I could not employ that unqualified denunciation of slaveholders, which is, to say the least, excusable in one who has been a victim; but he knew my views on this point when he was at Bridgwater. I subscribed for his paper half a year, asking for the copy to be sent to some coloured man, which gratified him. The elevation of the free coloured race is a most important instrumentality for emancipation, and a man of talent and independence of character like Douglass is a telling argument against the pretended necessity of slavery. While we were chatting together, the conductor, according to American custom, was walking through the carriage to look at the tickets, and came to where we were sitting. I observed that D. pulled out his ticket much more at his leisure than I had done. When the conductor had passed, D. asked me if he seemed civil. I said, Quite so. A few years ago, he observed, that man hit my hands, and dragged me out of the car. A great change has come over public opinion. Many of the coloured people at first were diffident, and did not like for D. and others to provoke illwill by struggling for their rights; but now they are glad to enjoy them. I saw them in first-class railway cars not unfrequently, and in the omnibuses. It may have been accidental, but I thought that they generally went to the end of the cars, as if they did not feel yet quite at home there. I had some conversation with a respectable coloured man, on one of the Lake Erie steamers; and he spoke warmly of the improvement, and the kinder usage which he received; but I did not notice him at table with us. I saw coloured people in civic processions, public meetings, &c., at Boston; and though no doubt there is still a great deal of prejudice to overcome, it is, I think, decidedly abating.* The question that was then agitating the public mind in

* No doubt the labours of the abolitionists have been very important in raising the coloured race; but the gentlemanly feeling and sturdy common sense of others has not been unavailing. Mr. Edmund Quincy is an earnest abolitionist, but his father is a whig of the old school. When President of the University

relation to them, was that of separate coloured schools, which at first, as I was told, were accepted as a boon by the coloured population, and are even now preferred by the less aspiring of their number. It is, however, obviously at variance with the spirit of equality, that colour should exclude from those public schools which are free to all—even to the child of the poorest Irish immigrant. If their right to admission were granted, as in many places it is, there might be no objection to schools supported by private benevolence for coloured children, as there are now for white ones, whom circumstances indispose from attending the ordinary schools. One advantage of coloured schools, as of coloured congregations, is, that it helps to raise a class of coloured teachers and preachers who might else, at present, fail of a situation. At a festive gathering of a normal school at W. Newton, Mass., I met a coloured lady, who seemed very well received. It is a fortunate circumstance that the great advocate of education, Horace Mann, is a distinguished advocate for freedom and equal rights.

None of our ministers, with whom I conversed on the subject, expressed that aversion to Negroes which Dr. Tuckerman and others had to cure with so much difficulty. I was at a very pleasant gathering of ministers at Boston, comprising some of the most influential, and, as they might be regarded, some of the most conservative of the body. The business of the meeting was concluded, when Josiah Henson was introduced, a fugitive slave who has settled in Canada. I was pleased at the cordial greeting which he received. He was installed in an arm-chair, and for about an hour conversed on subjects connected with slavery. Some one asked him what he thought of the position of the clergy in this matter. He sagaciously replied, that he greatly disapproved of all "epithetic" observations on them; but he shortly after gave us quite an earnest harangue, in the manner of a sermon, as to how persons would feel on their dying beds who had been idle or indifferent on this subject. I was interested at seeing this complete Negro, a born slave, sitting and giving instruction to some of the leading minds of the country.

When I was at the ministerial conference at Portland, a handsome collation was prepared, the ladies presiding at the tables. It was at one time intended to invite the orthodox ministers. Dr. Nichols, the respected minister of the First Church, declared that there should be no reference to colour, and that the two orthodox coloured preachers should be invited with the rest. He told me, that though he was in

---

at Cambridge, Mass., Mr. Quincy was riding in an omnibus when a coloured lady wanted to get in. (The extreme courtesy shewn in America to white ladies is well known.) No one stirred, till the President himself made room for her; and now I understand that in the Cambridge omnibuses no difference is made in regard to colour. I heard another anecdote:—A coloured man was riding in a first-class railway car. A Southerner was excessively indignant; and, though he had close by him a coloured servant taking care of his children, he began to bluster at the conductor, and to tell him that either he or the nigger must leave the car. The poor conductor was frightened and about to succumb, when a great burly man, who was getting quite purple in the face from indignation at the fiery Southerner, roared out to the conductor, that he should turn the black man out at his peril; for he had as soon travel with a nigger as with a damned fool! The said fool at once collapsed, while the stout man felt himself bound in honour henceforth to be a defender of Negro rights.

no favour with the abolitionists, he felt so strongly on this subject, that he would rather have lost his parish than have refused to consort with his coloured brethren. He carried his point in the committee (composed of residents at Portland). It was afterwards found that some embarrassment might be caused to some orthodox ministers, if they went to a Unitarian collation; and therefore none were asked, I believe.

A brother minister, with whom I was staying at Boston, walked with me and with a coloured man through the streets of that city without making it appear that he was doing anything unusual. When I was stopping at Dr. Hill's at Worcester, a Negro called, I fancy for some aid. He was a minister among the coloured people, of whom there are about 200 there; but unfortunately they are divided between Zion and Bethel, so that neither shepherd has much of a flock! He told me that F. Douglass was one of "his boys," as he first gave him licence to preach. I felt that it was much easier to feel on terms of equality with such men as Douglass, than with the coarser, commonplace specimens of the race. This worthy man went out as waiter or coachman, I believe, to increase his means of living, for which he is of course to be commended. Dr. H. asked him to remain to dinner, though there were two young ladies visiting him; and afterwards he rode between us to town in Dr. H.'s open carriage. An ex-governor of the State called whilst he was there, and shook hands with him. Dr. H. is not one of the Garrisonians; but he did not make any parade of what he did, as though it was an unusual condescension. I was glad to refer to cases like these, when I heard Southern men saying that free blacks were more contemptuously treated in the North than with them.

I think that I had unusual opportunities of becoming acquainted with the feelings of our brethren; for two-thirds of my American year was spent in private houses. I was the guest of a great many ministers, and had social intercourse with many more. I am glad of this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for the unmeasured kindness which was shewn me. It was not confined to one party: some of my most valued friends were Conservatives, others Garrisonians; while the majority, especially among the younger men, seemed to me to accord in the views of Ware and Channing. The general tone of feeling among them was certainly more anti-slavery than I had expected, though there was the diversity of view which always results from independent thought. I was told that it is now as unpopular to defend slavery in our churches, as it was ten years ago to preach against it. The subject was noticed, in connection with other moral movements, on public occasions.* Perhaps my visit was at a favourable juncture.

* At the Unitarian Association, meeting in Dr. Gannett's church, May 1850, the Rev. H. Bellows alluded to the heavy cloud of domestic slavery. I was called upon next, and commenced thus:—"The black cloud to which the last speaker has alluded has saddened us, even on the other side of the Atlantic. When we contrasted that freedom and prosperity which might naturally excite your pride, with that baneful and humiliating institution, we were reminded of the providence of God, who permitted the apostle a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure. To many of my brethren that cloud seemed to shed so much of its darkness even here, that they feared to come among you; but, whilst not insensible of the

The threatened ignominy of the horrible Fugitive Slave Bill called out the love of freedom, which had been too often dormant. I confess my disappointment at the comparative silence which has since prevailed on the subject; but there are many who warmly protested against the making of the law, who suppose that, now that it is made, a different course of conduct is incumbent on them. My impression of their present position with regard to it is derived from my correspondents, and from my constant reading of the Christian Register.* I never met with a single advocate for slavery among Unitarian ministers, though, from extracts from the sermons of the Rev. T. Clapp, of New Orleans, I fear that such advocates may be found; nor do I know that any of them approve the atrociously unjust provisions of the Fugitive Slave Bill, though some, viewing the matter constitutionally, might say that Congress could not do other than pass some such law, if called on by the South to do so. Dr. Dewey† and a few others, as it is well known, say that, as the law of the land, it must be obeyed. Others, feeling the complexity of the question, by their apologies for the maintainers of the law, and their silence as to its iniquity, are ranked among its supporters. Some of these men, though deficient in the perception of wrongs in another clime, are remarkable for their generous defence of the injured, and self-sacrificing kindness to sufferers who have come within the range of their sympathies. Others, again, have viewed the matter, not from the constitutional, but the human point of view, and have boldly expressed their indignation, not only before, but after, it became law, and their fixed determination to oppose it, in a way which warms our hearts. Theodore Parker states his intention to resort to violence, if necessary, for the defence of the fugitive. His allusion to

---

evil, it has been my privilege to behold the rainbow of promise, and to know that there was light which would dissipate the gloom. * * * The great principles which we hold in common, on each side the ocean, are mitigating the evils in the world, and preparing for their gradual extinction." My remarks were well received, even by those whom the Garrisonians call pro-slavery; but my friend Dr. Gilman wrote to me that they occasioned him both mortification and regret. "I was unable to circulate the Annual Report among my people; yet your intentions, I have no doubt, were honest and fair."

* The editors of this paper are the Rev. A. P. Peabody, who took decided anti-slavery ground in his paper on the Duties of the North; the Rev. J. H. Morison, who is of the school of Henry Ware; and the Rev. F. D. Huntingdon, with whose views I am less acquainted, though I know him to be interested in the various philanthropic movements. These gentlemen are men of the first standing in our body. The Rev. Dr. Peabody, who is regarded as conservative, and the Rev. J. Parkman, who is an abolitionist, have both recently retired from the editorship.

† Dr. Dewey's shocking expression,—for every filial feeling is outraged by it,—that he would rather send his own mother into slavery, and go himself, than see the union between the free and slaveholding States dissolved, seems to indicate a degraded carelessness or blind ignorance of the evils of slavery, or a very exaggerated idea of the importance of the Union; yet it does not prove that he thinks slavery desirable—only the least of two evils. A noted abolitionist, Parker Pillsbury, is reported to have said, "The American Union! Union of whom? I would not pay such a price for union with the blest in heaven. I would rather suffer damnation for ever and ever." But probably it would be incorrect to regard him as *pro-eternal-damnation*. An advocate of non-resistance might be driven to say, that, rather than kill men in the blossom of their sin, he would see his mother murdered before his eyes, and die himself; but it would not be charitable to regard him as somewhat favourable to the murder of

his ancestral sword and revolutionary pistols reads a little theatrical: if arms are used, more modern ones would be more killing: no one, however, who has marked his course, will doubt his entire earnestness and sincerity. Hitherto the abolitionists have been the great advocates for peace; and although we excuse a man who takes murderous weapons on a sudden impulse of self-defence, such deliberate professions of bloody resistance to the laws of the land give a handle to the oppressor, and produce a reaction in favour of what is represented as the cause of order. Lynch lawlessness, as well as Lynch law, may be dictated by a great thirst for justice; but it is a thirst which leads to intemperance. The riot in favour of a fugitive at Boston has, I think, occasioned a greater timidity in the utterances of our body. An influential minister, after deprecating the violence of speech which aggravates a sectional feeling already so passionate as well nigh to create civil war, adds,—"For my part, without deciding whether the Fugitive Slave Law of 1851 is or is not worse than the old law of 1793, I shall have nothing to do with the law. I shall obey it only in its penalties; but I shall not prevent public officers executing it. I will not join mobs nor encourage them, nor by harsh words raise them. I mean to bear patiently, hopefully, prayerfully—speak and preach when I think any good can come of it, otherwise be silent." It is, I believe, the resolution of the majority of our ministers to shew their respect for the law of God by harbouring the fugitive, and for that of man by submitting to the penalty. The "mission of silence" has exposed many to a great deal of obloquy and ridicule. We always admire courage; and even a reckless daring is more attractive, to those who are uninjured by it, than prudence. The question arises, whether this prudence is selfish or disinterested, and our decision will be guided by our opinion of the individual. If it springs from cowardice, we despise it; if from a generous forbearance, preferring contempt to the injury which a Quixotic interference brings upon the sufferer, we honour it. Some believe that, till there is a reasonable prospect of repealing the law, agitation only makes it more active: they hope that it may share the fate of the old law, which in New England was rarely put in operation. My hopes in this matter are not quite so creeping; yet, whilst I regret this silence, I am not clear as to what example we set them. It is better to be a slave than a prisoner—that is, a slave at large than a slave in confinement; because all prisoners are of course slaves, separated from their families, not allowed to marry, far more dull and miserable and degraded than Negroes. Imprisonment is a punishment which the slave himself dreads. In England, many persons are imprisoned who are not moral agents—children who steal by order of their parents,—adults who break laws of which they may be ignorant, or of which they have never learnt the obligation. Far more persons are

---

mothers. It is fair to remark, that Dr. D. does not say that he was prepared to be a *slaveholder*, but a *slave*—to *suffer*, not to *do* wrong. I have not seen his sad speech, and many of your readers are probably better acquainted with it than I am: it is perhaps consistent with his views formerly expressed, and with his mode of viewing other moral questions. His intimate friends speak of him as a man of great independence of character. To us his independence seems less manifested against timeserving politicians than against overbearing reformers who do not convince him.

causelessly sent to slavery in England, and branded for life with the felon's mark, than there are returned fugitives in America. Soldiers have been entrapped into the service by those who were guilty of the awful crime of making them drunk; sailors have been impressed, actually kidnapped; and these men have not only been reduced to slavery—for no one who is acquainted with the rules of the service can pretend that it is otherwise—but a slavery which in their moments of thought they may feel positively abominable and cursed, obliging them to shed innocent blood. Yet, have the ministers of peace urged the duty of encouraging deserters, and braving the laws in their protection? Do we preach the duty of rescuing all persons whom we think unjustly sentenced, or sentenced to a punishment unjustly disproportionate to the offence? There are many among us who do not think it either right or wise to set laws at defiance, whilst we strive to amend them; and others, not very depraved, are so accustomed to these evils, that they scarcely attempt their cure. Channing truly says (Life, Vol. III. p. 142), "We are slow to believe that we are as blinded as those whose errors amaze us; but I begin to fear that the condition of society among ourselves may seem as shocking to a more enlightened and virtuous age as slavery does to us."

Ministers in America are somewhat differently situated from what they are with us. Though it sounds absurd for a young republic to be toryfied, it is true that those who seem only one remove from anarchy are more likely to dread it than those who live under an old-established government; and this will be particularly the case with the cultivated classes. Our clergy there more correspond with an established order, linked to existing institutions. We Dissenters, on the contrary, are hereditary nonconformists, and feel that we may indulge our fault-finding propensities with all freedom: there is little danger of our moving the world too fast, and the Government Church will take care that no abuses perish too soon. At the same time, it is fair to say that some of the boldest spirits in America are to be found among our clergy there. We hear in England the complaints of the abolitionists, which seem confirmed by occasional extracts from the conservative papers, eager to make the most of the countenance that is shewn this bad law; but a wider knowledge of the American press would convince us that those whom we rebuke for their cowardice have to brunt the storm of those who reproach them for their anarchical tendencies, and our ministers are charged with ultra-radicalism! So difficult is it to form an estimate of a widely-scattered body of men, living under varied influences, guided by different fundamental rules of action, only united in adherence to the doctrine of the Divine Unity.

As to the mode of preaching proper on the slavery question, there is great diversity of opinion. Some, at the risk of obloquy, poverty, and, what is far more trying, expulsion from a people dearly beloved and longed for, have preached boldly, searchingly and pointedly upon it. They have made the sacrifice, and have resigned their pulpits; but their successors have found speech on the same subject far easier, and the absolute silence which was once required is now generally unpopular. We must judge of a man's conduct in this matter by his general style of preaching. If he is very plain and direct in his allusions to other particular sins, and omits this, it may be supposed that

he is either cowardly or indifferent respecting it; but, on the other hand, he may make it his general practice to lay down fundamental principles, and leave the application to his hearers. Some ministers who have adopted this latter course, suppose that they can trace to it an improved sentiment on this subject among their people. At all events, those who, engaging in great and unpopular movements at home, have found their warmth produce coldness, and have alienated where they wished to convince, and have felt how solemn a thing it is to divide a church and the families in it, will judge charitably of those who hesitate how best to attain the object they may have at heart. There is this additional difficulty. An English preacher on temperance, e. g., urges something practical, and in no way political. An anti-slavery preacher may be thought political or sentimental. If he eschew politics, he speaks of an institution of other States: his hearers are not told to alter their own habits, for they do not keep slaves, but to oppose those of men living under other governments; and if *feeling* is excited too frequently, without any direct effect on the *conduct*, sentiment ferments into sentimentality. If, on the other hand, he exhort to action, it will be commonly understood to denote political action—voting for some candidate, petitioning against some law, or supporting a party opposed to all candidates and to the Constitution itself. At home, our congregations for the most part support one section of the political world; but there they are of all parties. In one State, the three rival candidates for Governor—Whig, Democratic and Free-soil—all belonged to the same congregation. It may easily be imagined how little sacred would be the feelings which a minister would excite, who was supposed to be using the pulpit as an election engine. And even when he lays down great truths, those who might receive them with patience in ordinary circumstances—perhaps have actually done so—are very sore if they suppose that it has cost them their office. It would not be fair to judge of the Unitarian laity by the resignations of ministers in consequence of their advocacy of freedom. In many cases the violent dissentients were a minority, even a small one, but enough to destroy a minister's comfort; and those who have left one post for this cause, have sometimes found another more influential. I confess, however, that I do not envy the position of an American minister at this juncture. Those who desire to fulfil their duty as the moral guides of the community,—the followers of him who came to save the lost and break every yoke,—have great need of wisdom to direct, of love to bear, and courage to act; but we cannot doubt whose blessing follows those who give up all for the truth's sake.

These remarks may be borne in mind in relation to our religious newspapers there. Owing to the abundance of papers, subscribers do not depend on their denominational paper for their general intelligence. The Register is not like our Inquirer. It scrupulously avoids touching on politics. Its supporters are of all parties, and the character of the paper would be altogether changed if it entered on party strife. There is a wider line than with us between the so-called *secular* and *religious* papers; and questions which with us are simple moral questions, are discussed with fierce political rancour. Hence the Register has been more reserved than we could wish on the Fugitive Slave Bill, since it has become law, with a political party as its champion; but I

rarely see a number without some article against slavery, or in defence of the rights of conscience in relation to it.

I mentioned in my first paper that I met some of the leaders of the Free-soil party in Washington. I saw others of them at Boston, among whom I may mention Hon. Charles Sumner, the present senator for Massachusetts, and Dr. Palfrey. Dr. Palfrey visited this country when he was Theological Professor at Cambridge. He edited my father's Harmony in America, and has made important contributions to theological literature. Some years ago he relinquished the ministry, and, like his predecessor, Mr. Everett, devoted himself to politics,—not, however, with equal success. He joined the Free-soil party, and has for some time been out of office. He is the Free-soil candidate for Governor, but with little chance of election. No one can doubt that he has made a sacrifice for freedom; but this is not his first sacrifice. His father was a Boston merchant, who settled in Louisiana, where two of Dr. P.'s brothers still reside. Dr. P. set his share of the slaves free. I was conversing with him on the laxity of the marriage contract among Negroes; and he mentioned, that finding that one of the women whom he liberated had a husband who was a slave in a neighbouring plantation, he wrote to his master, asking him to name a price,—wishing to set him free, to live with his wife. The planter coolly replied that he did not want to sell him, and had furnished him with another wife. Dr. P. had never had any intercourse with Garrison, except when they had met on some town committee, and has shared the attacks which the Garrisonians make on his party; but I found at the South that such an act as his is more convincing than the most vehement speeches. They are always taunting the North with their want of sincerity. "You talk," say they, "of remembering those in bonds as bound with them; and certainly you speak against us as if you had actually seen your own mothers whipped before your eyes. You call us pirates and robbers: yet if *you* were in the shocking state you describe, would you hesitate about giving up your money to be delivered from it? If your mother were taken by a pirate, would you doubt as to the propriety of ransoming her, lest you should seem to acknowledge his right to capture her? Slavery, you say, is worse than death; yet if a robber asked for your money or your life, would you decline giving the money, lest it should indicate his right to it? We don't believe you. You demand from us a sacrifice which our consciences do not require, but plead conscience against making any sacrifice yourselves. You sneer and reproach the consciences of those who let a slave be taken back to his master rather than break a law of the land; yet expect us to respect your consciences, who let a slave be taken back to hell, as you call it, rather than put your hands in your pockets." To reasoners of this kind, who are not aware of the sacrifices the genuine abolitionists are making, such a plain, unmistakeable, palpable sacrifice as Dr. P. has made, speaks volumes. I heard Dr. P. make perhaps one of the most finished and touching speeches which I have ever listened to, at the Unitarian gathering, which greatly moved even his political opponents. I was scarcely prepared for the acrimony with which the Free-soilers are viewed; but the Whigs of Massachusetts attribute to them some sore defeats. The consistent men of their party are among the most powerful and influential advocates of freedom: as a party, however, they

will be liable to those temptations to sacrifice principle to expediency to which other parties have at times succumbed. From this insinuation I must certainly except the Garrisonians, who in a remarkable degree sacrifice expediency to principle.

It will be expected that I should say something of the abolitionists; yet it is painful to speak where one is sure to be misunderstood. A Yankee is properly a New-Englander; whilst in remote parts of the Union all Northerners are so called, and we give the name to inhabitants of the United States generally: so some Southerners call all Northerners abolitionists, whilst those in the North so name the advocates of abolition; whilst in New England the term especially denotes the Garrisonians. Many are therefore embraced under this wide name, who are men of a very different spirit from the noble and disinterested labourers whom we honour. Some adopt the cry, in districts where it is popular, for political and selfish purposes. Some are actuated by pride,—vehement against the slaveholders for their pretensions and arrogance,—arrogant themselves towards the coloured race whose cause they espouse, like some haughty democrats at home. Some, with all their horror at the burden of slavery, will not move it with their fingers, only if possible with their tongues; men who make no pretension to anti-slavery zeal will often give and do far more to redeem a captive, than those whose mouths open more easily than their purses. Some profess abolitionism just as men migrate to the back woods—to feel themselves free from all restraint. If they give up the pleasure of co-operating with an important party, they love, in these moral "clearings," to have unbounded licence to say bitter things against all existing institutions of church, state and society. (See Prospective Review for last November, "The American Fugitive Slave Act.") Whilst others, again, are men who, loving peace and good-will, and valuing a position in society, and income, and reputation, and the kindly appreciation of friends, have sacrificed everything for the oppressed's sake, knowing that what they do for the least of Christ's brethren, they do for him. So vast is the diversity among them, that you must judge each by himself, or refrain from judging at all.

Though I attended more anti-slavery meetings than temperance ones, they were but few—though I think that the half-dozen or so at which I was present afforded me a tolerable specimen. The meeting at which I spoke was at the celebration of West-Indian independence. There I felt in place as an Englishman; but at public meetings to assail the Union and reproach public men, I should have thought it as improper for me to take a part, as for an American minister to be conspicuous at a revolutionary meeting in England. Much that I heard at their Convention was certainly offensive. I did not like the glee of the audience when public men were "killed," or, as we might say, "cut up." If there is joy in heaven over the sinner that repenteth, pleasure in the inspection of other men's sins is felt elsewhere. It seemed to me that some speakers were, unintentionally, feeding malignant passions. As I knew pretty well what they meant, I did not allow myself to be much disturbed at some of their startling expressions. My friend W. Mountford, however, who came fresh to it, was filled with intense disgust when he heard H. C. Wright intimating his intention to trample on the Bible if there was anything pro-slavery in it, and to defy the Old-

Testament God. M. was nearly rising to remonstrate, but he was prudently silent. He has since learnt what a man must expect who has the honesty to utter what he thinks.*

What I heard led me to feel that the breach between the church and the Garrisonians was so wide, that it was hopeless to attempt any cordial union between them. The church must be anti-slavery after its manner, and the Garrisonians religious after their manner; and the wise men of each party will learn of the other. Unhappily, those who have set up for sanctity have been so cool about humanity, that the advocates for humanity are very suspicious of sanctity. Pious people say things which outrage the humane, and humane men outrage the pious. If humane men cannot bear to have their brother treated as a chattel, devout men are not partial to hearing their Heavenly Father (for so Christ calls the God of the patriarchs) treated as worse than a chattel—defied and scorned as a monstrosity. The church has much to answer for. In old times it set itself against science, and the philosophers derided it; and now it has provoked the burning scorn of philanthropists. Where it does its duty, it may have philosophy and philanthropy as its faithful friends and servants.

---

* He addressed a letter to our *Inquirer* against the proposed excommunication of American ministers, on the ground that we could as little understand their position in regard to the Abolition movement, as they could ours in regard to the Chartist and other movements. More than a column is devoted to him in the *Liberator*, of which the first paragraph may be taken as a specimen:—"Mr. Mountford is an English Unitarian clergyman settled at Gloucester, in this State. Whether he belongs to that class

'Who leave their country for their country's good,'

or not, his short residence here has already made it very clear that he is no acquisition to the land of his adoption. The almost entire recreancy of the American pulpit to the cause of the heart-broken slave population at the South, renders it quite insupportable that it should be upheld and extended by foreign importation. The most despicable as well as the most dangerous of all trimmers and time-servers is he who, claiming to be a minister of Jesus Christ (the most fearless and radical reformer who has ever appeared), is disposed to connive at popular wrong, and to cry, Peace! peace! when there is no peace. He is both a coward and a traitor of the basest type." I have given this extract, because your readers, who know Mr. M., will be able to judge what value is to be attached to similar censures of those whom they do not know. Mr. M. is not singular in his comparisons. Joseph Barker was supposed fully to sympathize with Garrison; and as he edited a collection of the horrors of American Slavery, he may be regarded as acquainted with them. Yet in a letter from America to B. Barker, which I suppose is his (*The People*, No. 75, Vol. II.), he writes as follows:—"I consider that the aristocrats of Great Britain and Ireland are as really slaveholders as the slaveholders in the Southern States of America, and that the working classes are as really slaves as the poor chained Negroes of the Southern States." . . . . . "True, there is slavery here (in America), and slavery is a terrible evil. It is nevertheless a fact, that the slavery of the Southern States neither starves men to death so often, nor separates husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, so frequently, nor causes so much disease, nor so many violent deaths, as the horrible system of oppression prevailing in Great Britain and Ireland. True, slavery is the lowest state of man. It is a state in which humanity cannot long remain. It is nevertheless true, I believe, that the generality of the working people of Ireland are neither so well clad, so well fed, nor so well used in general, as the Negro slaves of the South. That is my opinion. And there appears to be a better prospect of speedily abolishing slavery, than there does of annihilating the aristocratic tyranny of Great Britain and Ireland, and popularizing their general and local governments."

I have, as you know, some experience in the moral movements in England, and the churches have been regarded as indifferent or even obstructive to them; but I have never heard at home such abuse of religious bodies and institutions as in America; if I did, I could not act with them without such protests as would make my co-operation unacceptable. But the bond of our teetotal societies, e. g., is *action*, not *opinion*. Any man who pledges himself to abstain from intoxicating drinks is a teetotaler, and the utmost strictness as to practice is combined with boundless freedom of opinion as to the way in which the intemperate are to be regarded. But a man by abstaining from slaveholding is not thereby an abolitionist: the bond of the society is opinion, not as to our own conduct so much as to that of others. The practice of the Garrisonian need not be different from that of other men; he may, or may not, partake of slave produce; other men may be as ready as he to redeem a fugitive or to suffer for him, and to treat the coloured race as brethren. He, and those whom he reviles, may and often do act in the same way towards the Negro. The main point at issue is, How is the master to be influenced? Is the union with him to be regarded as a covenant with hell and a league with death, or as a bond of peace which may ultimately draw him to the cause of freedom?

The use of the term *pro-slavery* by the Garrisonians, strikes me as incorrect and likely to mislead. *Pro* denotes the inclination of the act or the actor. If of the *act*, everything that has a tendency directly or indirectly to prolong slavery and aggravate its evils is *pro-slavery;* but this is matter of opinion: it is the very charge brought warmly, and I have no doubt sincerely, against the Garrisonians themselves. If of the *doer*, we have no right to say that a man favours a sin because he does not accord in our way of uprooting it. Some teetotallers believe that if there were no moderate drinking there would be no drunkenness; but it would be deemed very unjust to call such moderate men *pro-drunkenness*, as if they were inclined to that vice. But, as I have said, these Northern pro-slavery men may be as free from slaveholding, even of the mildest form, as the Garrisonians themselves, and may protest against it. What would be thought if we called a man *pro-drunkenness*, who was a strict abstainer and an able and sincere defender of abstinence, because he does not think it proper to denounce all makers, vendors and drinkers, and has spoken strongly on what he supposes the errors of teetotallers? To say that slavery is the most hellish of crimes, and then to charge men with favouring it who are not only innocent, but express their abhorrence of it, seems to me unchristian and paradoxical. But paradox is a favourite weapon with them. Now that the evil of slavery is generally acknowledged, the topic does not seem sufficiently exciting to draw an audience. Their vehemence is often directed against those who are labouring to raise the condition of the Negro by a different instrumentality from their own. Many think it better, or easier, to destroy than improve; and if any err from the truth, they do not restore them in the spirit of meekness. If a politician or clergyman has influence and uses it ill, they try to destroy his influence by blasting his character, as if he were a rock in their way. It did not seem to me that they were worse in this respect than some others. They do as they have been done by. Party vituperations in America are offensive and unjust in the extreme. Only one would wish the lovers of man-

kind to speak in love, and the friends of freedom to avoid moral despotism. We raise a high standard for them. Theology is of the old times, and has often the acerbity of age; young philanthropy should have the sweetness as well as the vigour of childhood. *Odium theologicum* is too bad for us to desire *odium philanthropicum*. But moralists have similar dangers to religionists. The moral bigot is as positive as to the truth of his convictions and the wickedness of contrary ones as the doctrinal bigot; and fanaticism and intolerance are injurious and dangerous in each case. On the other hand, we ought to make the same allowances for those who seem perhaps over-zealous in behalf of man, that we do for those who are zealots for God. Each party is attempting a great work.

My personal intercourse with abolitionists was very pleasant. When hearing them speak, I was often reminded of what one of their number gave me as his reason for not attending their Convention. He stopped away partly because he heard nothing new, but also because it was not pleasant to hear people whom he liked say things which he did not like. Incompleteness misleads. Half a loaf is better than no bread, but half a truth is often worse than silence; and I frequently felt that, whatever might be my accordance with their speakers, their want of completeness gave an entirely wrong impression.* In conversation this could be altered. I freely told them my objections, which they kindly met, and we talked pleasantly of some of those other things by and for which men live. In my book of extracts, Garrison and Dr. Gannett appear side by side: we had this link of sympathy—there were friends in England who loved us all. I spent no happier or more profitable days than those which I enjoyed in the religious and affectionate homes of each of the Messrs. May and other leading abolitionists; and I do not know any who had my fuller sympathy on this subject than those who laboured for the slave as the ministers of Christ, who did not allow the Egyptian darkness to overwhelm them, but were cheered in their labours by the light of love for the erring and faith in God.

The Garrisonians have laboured devotedly in a glorious cause, and they cannot yet be spared. I am not prepared to deny that since their agitation the slaves have been more rigorously dealt with, from real or affected fear on the part of the masters, whose pride is more than ever enlisted in the maintenance of the system: in other States, however, there has been improvement. But in the North there has been a decided advance, much of which must be attributed to their unceasing exertions,† and if they have done harm, good preponderates as far as

---

* Perhaps this is almost unavoidable in a party meeting. The panegyrics on the Union uttered by the opposite party seemed to me equally one-sided.

† All societies attacking existing institutions cause a temporary reaction. The ardour of Dissenters stimulates the Church. The Reformation Society inflames the Catholics. Unitarians are more opposed to Popery than any other body, yet they discountenance the Reformation Society, though the courage and zeal of many of its speakers are undoubted, and the Catholic Church is chargeable with countless errors and crimes: we think it well, if we want to convince a man, not to taunt him with his absurdities alone, but to do justice to everything which modifies them. One of our ministers told me that it only did him harm to read the unceasing accusations of the abolitionists: he is called *pro-slavery;* yet so great is his disgust at slavery, that he assured me he had never entered a slave State, as he could not endure the sight of it.

the cause of freedom is concerned. If I resided in America, I should probably not connect myself with them, but should prefer striving for freedom freely; but I have every year given or procured contributions to their bazaar, because I honour their unflinching, self-sacrificing integrity; and those who discard all the ties of country for the slave's sake deserve the sympathy of men of all countries. To labour with them in America might be taken as an endorsement of much that would offend our consciences; but by aiding them here we do not enter into their feuds with governments and religions, but aid "*anti*-slavery in the abstract," distinct from the questionable peculiarities of its advocates. Philanthropy requires a missionary spirit as well as theology; and if it is right to send out preachers to convert the heathens abroad, though we have practical heathenism at home, I do not know why we should not help to assail slavery abroad, though we have practical slavery at home.

Before I close this letter (which I have already extended far beyond my wish, though much has been omitted which I desired to say), I may advert to what we have already done. After a visit from Mr. S. May, Jun., a letter of brotherly remonstrance was sent from the Unitarian ministers of this country which was numerously signed, and received an answer which indicated that it had done good. After a visit of F. Douglass to Bridgwater, I was commissioned by a committee, appointed at a public meeting, to draw up a letter on the subject to our namesake in Massachusetts, which had considerable dealings with the South. It fortunately met the approval of the Garrisonians, without exciting any hostile feeling in those whom it addressed: we had an answer very numerously signed: it drew increased attention to the question in the locality, and their neighbours at Taunton said that they would like a letter from their English namesake, couched in the same fraternal spirit. When an invitation was sent to our ministers to attend the Boston Unitarian anniversaries, a reply was drawn up, declining, on the ground, I believe, that a slaveholder was or had been an officer of the Association. Some of us could not conscientiously sign this letter, as it was not accordant with our principles nor our practices in parallel cases. This reply does not seem to have been effective of much good; and as it was signed by laymen, those who objected to it, intimated that they did not want a refusal from persons whom they had never invited. There has been more recently an attempt to pass a resolution, excluding from our pulpits all American ministers who are not sound on this question. As such a step was generally regarded as inconsistent with our congregational usages, it was only carried, I believe, in one instance. Its adoption would have led to some perplexity and many inconsistencies among ourselves, and might have exposed our American abolitionist ministers to great annoyance. When I was there, they freely exchanged pulpits with their brethren. If our exclusiveness had led to exclusiveness there, their influence would have been narrowed, and jealousy and unkindness might have been the result. Many of our congregations sent remonstrances, some of which might have less weight from their apparent ignorance of the origin of the Fugitive Slave Bill,—supposing its principle to be an innovation. The judge must know both sides, and hear all the evidence: where resolutions appear echoes of the Garrisonian party, those who are not

affected by the voice, are not much moved by the echo; and the American Unitarian papers have shewn no greater forwardness to insert our resolutions, than our periodicals might be to give publicity to any series of American documents which they thought incorrect. I should be extremely sorry if our hearts did not burn with indignation at so abominable a law, and at the whole system which inflicts such awful wrong—moral, mental, and often physical—on three millions of our fellow-beings: and it is the word from the heart which goes to the heart. Whatever we can do we ought to do, to lessen the evil. We should keep it in mind as the great wrong, which no false politeness should make us blink when Americans boast to us of the glory of their institutions. The law has this good effect, that the North can no longer pretend that it has nothing to do with the system. Unless they think their government a mass of rottenness, which it is death to touch, they must desire to shew their country as it ought to be—in the van, not the rear, of freedom. In our addresses to individuals or churches, we should be guided by our own experience. If we are improved by censures for faults to which we do not plead guilty, let us thus censure others; if fierce invectives for acknowledged evil help us to quit it, let us not spare invectives: they may at all events help to neutralize those of the South, or the conservatives of the North, in the minds of the wavering. If it is kindness which subdues us, let us overcome evil with good; if we are moved by appeals to our better natures, and encouraged by hope, let us administer life's best cordial to those who are silent through despondency. Whatever we would that men should do to us, let us do to them.

From England, America inherited slavery. Let it have her aid to uproot it: let us strive to instruct the myriads who leave our shores to settle there, in their duties to the coloured race: let us assist our Transatlantic visitors to be free from their prejudices, and to love equal rights. Let us help to raise the condition of our enfranchised population in the West Indies, to whom the Americans look to see the results of freedom, and who are quite as much our concern as the inhabitants of the States. Let us raise our degraded population at home, lest our selfish neglect bring distrust upon freedom. Let us root out from ourselves all moral and spiritual slavery, and never try to crush what we dislike, or to tyrannize over what we despise. When we act consistently with our Christian profession in our home walks, we shall have a Christ-like strength to break the yoke and set the oppressed free in distant lands: the truth that makes us free shall free others; and those who do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven, may pray with full assurance of faith, Thy kingdom come.

Yours respectfully,

Birkenhead, Nov. 4, 1851. R. L. Carpenter.

A HINT TO IMITATORS.

Stammering and squinting are often caught by mimicry; and he who wilfully distorts his mind, for whatever purpose, may stamp its lineaments with irrecoverable deformity.—*Hartley Coleridge.*

A SECOND CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF GEORGE MATHEWS, *alias* DUNCAN CHISHOLM, LATE CLERK IN THE CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE, DUBLIN CASTLE.

"I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay-tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found."

I STILL fear that my narrative of some of the proceedings of this bold and bad man, in his religious disguise, will prove uninteresting to many of your readers, who may not understand the peculiar position of Unitarians in this country, and the difficulties with which they have had to contend. Though freed from the bondage of human tests of belief, they are associated as Presbyterians, and subject to the usual rules of Presbyterian discipline. Ministers in our connection are freely chosen by the members of the respective congregations; but their induction, and the future oversight of them, and their claims to certain privileges and endowments, devolve upon the Presbytery (an ecclesiastical court composed of clergymen and lay representatives of certain congregations), from whose decision there is no appeal. It was therefore a principal object with Mr. Mathews to obtain, if possible, an ascendancy in this body, and thereby to direct its future movements, for his own corrupt and selfish purposes. Some of his deep-laid schemes for this end I shall now endeavour to unfold.

When Mr. Mathews was first settled in Dublin, he attached himself to the orthodox Presbyterian church then meeting in Usher's Quay; but having, soon after his connection with them, given offence by an officious intermeddling with the management of their Trust funds, for which he shewed an early predilection, he was obliged to retire from that congregation. Being thus at large and disengaged, "a Gentleman in search of a Religion," he next joined a small body of Seceding Presbyterians, who, dissatisfied with the connection in which they stood, were endeavouring to organize a congregation. To them he was eminently useful; and by procuring for them a grant of Royal Bounty, through his influence at the Castle, and by the loan of money, of which he had, even then, by some means contrived to possess himself, rose to consideration and power amongst them. He was appointed and officiated as an elder in that church: but, even here, he was a dangerous friend; for having obtained the title-deeds of their chapel as a security for his advances, he began to exercise authority over them; and it was only by great exertion and at a very heavy cost that they were enabled to free themselves from the burthen of his patronage.

Mr. Quinn, whose name I introduced in my former letter, had been an unsuccessful candidate for the office of minister in this chapel; but, though unfitted for that situation, Mr. Mathews at once perceived that he might be made a useful instrument, in his hands, for other purposes. He was therefore sent southward on a mission, and speedily located himself in the town of Fermoy, in the county of Cork. Shortly after, a pamphlet, bearing his name on the title-page, but which I now firmly believe was written by Mr. Mathews, containing very liberal views, was sent, gratuitously, to all the ministers in Dublin

connected with the Munster Synod, from which the following is an extract:

"The early Reformers were placed in a difficult position. From the superstitious usages, and the gross ignorance of scriptural knowledge which then darkened the world, they deemed it expedient to draw up formulas and testimonies of divine truth for common edification. But we, who in all freedom have the Bible, with every privilege it brings, live in far more favoured circumstances, and can adopt or modify our creed, not by any established standard, but what appears to ourselves to be specially warranted by the canon of Scripture. The right which our forefathers exercised of drawing up a creed, is possessed to the very same extent by their posterity. It is not a collective or social right, empowering a part to rule the whole; it is an individual right belonging to each Christian, to frame his own creed, and of which he can never lawfully be dispossessed. To deny this, is to return to the state of affairs in which the traditions of men had erased the truths of God's word in Judæa, or when Christendom was sunk by the ascendancy of ecclesiastical Rome."

Whilst we in Dublin were yet wondering who this Mr. Quinn might be, who wrote so sensibly and liberally, Mr. Hutton, agent for the Royal Bounty to the Synod of Munster, received a warrant from the Castle, authorizing him to pay a certain portion of Regium Donum to the Rev. Robert Quinn, Presbyterian minister of Fermoy. Upon consulting with his brethren, Mr. Hutton informed the Government that there was no minister in Fermoy known to the Synod of Munster; and the warrant was withdrawn. There is no direct proof that this attempted imposition on the Government and on the Synod of Munster was the work of Mr. Mathews, but it is well ascertained that Mr. Quinn went to the South of Ireland by Mr. Mathews' advice, was his correspondent whilst on his mission, and that the warrant for Royal Bounty thus surreptitiously procured was in his hand-writing.

This mode of introduction to us not proving successful, Mr. Quinn next addressed himself to the late Rev. Dr. Armstrong, whose kindliness of disposition and genuine Christian liberality were often abused by artful and unprincipled men. To him he represented himself as a licentiate of the Seceding Church, but who, dissatisfied with subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, was anxious to be placed under the care of the Synod of Munster, that he might enjoy liberty of conscience. He also stated, that in consequence of the publication of his pamphlet, and his proposing to connect himself with the Synod of Munster, the Missionary Board in Belfast had withdrawn from him all countenance and support. This appeal to our compassionate and liberal feelings was successful; and the Synod, believing his artful tale, and looking upon him as a sufferer for conscience' sake, took pity upon him; and having fully explained to him and the people of Fermoy the fundamental principles of their Association, and having obtained from both parties their most unqualified and cordial approval of them, ordained him as minister of the congregation, and gave him an interest in the Widows' Fund, to which he had no claim, on the most liberal terms. The first step in advance was thus gained by the "Holy Alliance"—a traitor was introduced amongst us by falsehood and deceit, prepared to execute his vile part when occasion served, and, with rare baseness and ingratitude, to turn against us our generous and unsuspecting confidence.—I shall

here finish his story. He soon after joined as a Relator, with Mr. Mathews, in a Chancery-suit, instituted to visit with worldly loss the conscientious men who exercised those very privileges for which Mr. Quinn affected in his pamphlet zealously to contend; and, whilst he lived, he was an unscrupulous instrument in the hands of that evil-minded man who ceaselessly plotted our ruin.

The wedge being thus cautiously and securely introduced in the case of Fermoy, the next movement of the confederates was to add to their number and power by the revival of the extinct congregation of Tipperary.

This congregation had ceased to exist about thirty years before, and the zeal of the missionaries of the General Synod of Ulster, as well as of a Committee of our Synod, had been expended upon it in vain. Suddenly, without any apparent cause, it seemed to revive, and in a Memorial addressed to Government, which was referred to us, claimed a portion of Royal Bounty, as an ancient congregation in our connection. This step surprised and alarmed me. I could not understand how it was that a place which had been repeatedly visited as a missionary station, and had shewn no signs of life, should yet all at once spring up into a flourishing congregation claiming our support. I intimated to the late Dr. Armstrong, who was wholly unconscious of evil, my doubts and fears, and my determination to oppose the admission of Tipperary into our connection till farther inquiries should be made. The result proved that my apprehensions were well founded. Upon investigation, the Memorial addressed to Government was found to contain deliberate untruths, and purported to be signed by numbers who never had been members of any Presbyterian congregation, nor really intended to be. At this crisis, the secret convention entered into between the Northern missionary and certain members of our body for the overthrow of our institutions, already mentioned, became known to me, and we refused to admit those calling themselves the congregation of Tipperary into our connection.

I cannot tell at what date Mr. Mathews joined himself to this confederacy; but it was on this occasion that he first publicly interfered in our concerns. Aware of my intended opposition to the claims of the people of Tipperary, he called upon me, and placed in my hands a letter addressed to him by Mr. Quinn, of Fermoy, which I now believe was of his own concocting. In it the writer intimates his fears that the portion of Royal Bounty which he enjoyed, that had once been allocated to Tipperary, might be resumed, and applied as formerly. He then requests Mr. Mathews to permit himself to be nominated as elder, to attend the next meeting of Synod, "to strengthen the hands of the congregation of Fermoy, and perhaps to deter the Tipperary people from giving an infant congregation a deadly blow, knowing that he might be able to thwart them." It was evidently a primary object with Mr. Mathews to be admitted a member of our church courts; and though he resided more than one hundred miles from Fermoy, and was a member of another church, which rendered him totally ineligible, he probably imagined that, calculating on his support in my intended opposition to the claims of Tipperary, I might be disposed to overlook, in his case, such a gross violation of all Presbyterian usage. If such were his views, he on this, as well

as on some other occasions, totally misunderstood my character. Though unsuspicious of his meditated treachery, I opposed his admission on principle, and his name was withdrawn. You may judge of my surprise, after the letter which he had placed in my hands, to find that Mr. Quinn, at the meeting of Synod, gave his vote *in favour of the admission of Tipperary!* The votes on that occasion were equal, and had Mr. Mathews been admitted an elder, as was confidently hoped, Tipperary would have been placed on our roll, and the stability of our institutions, from the defections that soon after followed, would have been seriously endangered. The so-called orthodox party in our little Synod, having secured the valuable services of Mr. Mathews, were joined by the Rev. Dr. Sloane, of Cork, who, though he had been minister of the Unitarian congregation of Holywood, and an unsuccessful candidate for the Unitarian congregation of Strand Street, Dublin, and had professed Unitarian opinions when he was afterward chosen minister of Cork, suddenly discovered that he had always been a Trinitarian, and allied himself to those who at this time were peculiarly favoured by the authorities in the Castle of Dublin. Mr. M'Cance, of Waterford, who had previously "been all things to all men," having, with characteristic prudence, peered cautiously around him, ventured to lay aside his neutrality, and passed over to the camp of our enemies. Our little fortress was thus sadly beleaguered—yet even then stout hearts within determined to hold out to the last extremity. "*False brethren, unawares brought in, had indeed come in privily to spy out our liberty which we had in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with us.*"

I come now to a part of my narrative which, as it more immediately regards myself, I find it more difficult and painful to relate. A considerable time before any legal proceedings were instituted or threatened against us, Mr. Mathews, the principal Relator in those suits, sought and cultivated my acquaintance—intimated his disbelief of many of the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith—and procured from me some Unitarian books, with which, on returning them, he intimated, with very few exceptions, his perfect concurrence. He often attended at that time public worship in the congregation of Eustace Street, sometimes alone, and at other times accompanied by his wife and children, and expressed himself to several of my personal friends in terms of high approval of our religious services. To this point the following is the evidence of George Rankin, Esq., a member of the congregation, in the case of George Mathews and others *v.* Rev. Joseph Hutton, James C. Ledlie, D.D., and others, in the Court of Chancery:

"The Relator, George Mathews, as likewise his family, has *frequently*, before the filing of the present information, attended and joined in the religious services in the Presbyterian meeting-house in Eustace Street, in the city of Dublin; and he expressed to me, in *very strong terms*, HIS ENTIRE SATISFACTION WITH AND APPROBATION OF THE RELIGIOUS SERVICES THEREIN, and the very great pleasure he derived from the preaching of Dr. Ledlie, the minister of the congregation, and his wish in consequence to become one of its members."

During the continuance of this intercourse he went to London, and on his return told me, amongst other matters, how fortunate he had been in having had an opportunity of hearing the greater part of a course of Unitarian lectures that had been delivered by eminent ministers in Carter-Lane chapel. He presented me at the same time with a card, which is still in my possession, containing a list of the preachers and the dates and subjects of their discourses, and concluded with expressing much approbation of their services. It was, I think, on this occasion, as I afterwards ascertained, that he introduced himself to Mr. Mardon, the bookseller, requesting to be received by him as a boarder during his stay in London, representing himself as a recent convert to Unitarianism, and anxious to have an opportunity of meeting with Unitarian ministers, who frequented his house, that he might be still farther instructed in their opinions. Mr. Mardon assented, and he was an inmate of his family for some weeks, associating with Unitarian ministers, apparently on the most friendly footing, whilst he was making arrangements for attacking their funds and institutions!

About this time he suggested to me some plans for my professional advantage, to promote which he offered his services. To my intimate friends he also expressed a desire to be useful to my sons, some of whom were then ripening into manhood. Of any of these seemingly kind proposals I never was able to avail myself; but believing them, at that time, to be truly intended, I was sincerely grateful. Having thus lulled all suspicion of evil design, he applied to be admitted a member of the congregation of Eustace Street, by subscribing to its funds. It fortunately happened that Mr. Rankin, the gentleman to whom he made application, was not the Treasurer; and before the matter could be taken regularly into consideration, we were informed of the treacherous design, and put effectually on our guard. His object was to become a member of the congregation, that he might proceed against us by *bill*, instead of *information*,—a simpler, more effectual and less odious plan; and for this end he tried to qualify himself by a long course of hypocrisy, for which even a Jesuit might blush. Had he succeeded in his application, with the precedent of Wolverhampton against us, our case would have been utterly hopeless. We were saved from ruin by the honest interposition of the late Rev. Dr. Horner, of Dublin, and I gratefully record the fact to the honour of his memory. He not only refused to be a party to such proceedings, but called upon the late Rev. Dr. Armstrong, and warned him of the meditated plot that was laid against our congregations in Dublin. Mr. Mathews' subscription to our funds was consequently declined, and he was compelled to adopt the more tedious and invidious course.

Shortly after the refusal of the Synod of Munster to admit the congregation of Tipperary into their connection, Mr. Mathews asked for a conference with Dr. Armstrong and any friend whom he might select, on the subject of our ecclesiastical affairs; and I was the person chosen. Mr. Mathews then stated to us that he had been specially appointed by certain parties in the Church of Scotland, and in the General Synod of Ulster, to manage their affairs with regard to Presbyterian funds in this country, and furnished with a discretionary

power as to the settlement of their claims. He wished, he said, to avoid litigation, and for this purpose proposed to us the admission of Tipperary, and other congregations similarly circumstanced, into our connection, as the basis of an amicable adjustment. Upon seriously considering the matter, we declined the proposition, which we felt to be a virtual surrender of our rights and privileges, and a passing under the yoke of an intolerant ecclesiastical despotism. He then said that nothing remained but war—that the sword should now be drawn, and the scabbard thrown away. We retired from the conference anticipating evil, but prepared to endure it rather than compromise our independence,—"troubled on every side, yet not distressed—perplexed, but not in despair." I was then, and long after, at a loss to understand the motives which determined this extraordinary man to throw himself unreservedly into the arms of the party with which he was thenceforward closely united. Had he believed their doctrines, I could have accounted for his persecution of Unitarians on the ground of a burning religious zeal; but convinced, from his declarations to myself, and from his gross hypocrisy, which had now been laid bare, that he was no enthusiast, and "cared for none of these things," I could not explain his conduct on any known principles. There was, however, one element that went largely to the composition of his character, which I did not then think of, but which has since solved the difficulty—the love of plunder. He had no likelihood of making the Unitarians useful to him in this respect; and he eagerly set about the means of acquiring from others a power over the distribution of charitable funds, in which, whilst they remained in our hands, he could never hope to participate. The case of Eustace Street, as already detailed, where a pretended conversion to the opinions of the congregation was planned to compass their overthrow, clearly shews that the allied parties were not scrupulous as to the instrumentality they used, and that with them, as with some other religious zealots, "no faith should be kept with heretics," and that "the end sanctified the means."

This modern persecutor, then, "*having received authority and commission from the high-priests*," entered vigorously on his crusade. He first assailed what is called "the General Fund."

This Fund was instituted, in 1710, by Sir Arthur Langford and other zealous Protestant Dissenters, for the following purposes, as expressed in the trust-deed: "The support of religion in and about Dublin and the south of Ireland, by assisting and supporting the Protestant Dissenting interest against unreasonable prosecutions (some of which they have lately been exposed to, contrary to Her Majesty's sentiments publicly declared); and for the education of youth designed for the ministry amongst Protestant Dissenters; and for assisting Protestant Dissenting congregations that are poor and unable to provide for their ministers; and for such other pious and religious ends, and by such means as shall, by the subscribers hereunto, be thought proper and reasonable for promoting the design and intention herein expressed."

This Fund was faithfully administered by twenty-one Trustees, admitted by Mr. Mathews himself to have been "excellent and respectable" men; nor was the slightest imputation ever made that they had

at any time neglected their duties or abused the confidence reposed in them. They gave assistance to applicants without any doctrinal distinction; and though the majority (twelve out of twenty-one) were Unitarians, two-thirds of the Fund were allocated to Trinitarian purposes. Not satisfied, however, with this liberal share, the orthodox Presbyterians who had leagued themselves with Mr. Mathews and chosen him for their leader, grasped at the possession of the whole. It was alleged, upon diligent inquiry, that probably Sir Arthur Langford, with whom the Trust originated, was a Trinitarian, and therefore, according to the decision in Lady Hewley's case, the distribution and enjoyment of the funds must be confined to Trinitarians, though the deed is utterly silent on the subject, and the obvious purpose of the benevolent and public-spirited founders was to secure religious freedom, and not to promote the advocacy of any peculiar doctrinal opinions. The decision, however, was pronounced agreeably to the Hewley precedent, and the Unitarians were removed from all management and participation in a charity which their fathers and predecessors had principally founded, and themselves had administered with such praiseworthy liberality.

Encouraged by his success in this case, Mr. Mathews' next step was to file a most voluminous information, in the name of the Attorney-General for Ireland, in the Court of Chancery against the ministers and the principal members of the congregations of Eustace Street and Strand Street, in Dublin. The avowed object of these proceedings was not only to gain possession of the meeting-houses and funds of every kind connected with them, but to remove entirely the officiating ministers, to deprive them of all present support, and their widows and fatherless children (when they should be no more) of those sacred funds which Christian benevolence had set apart for their benefit.

In Eustace-Street congregation, the Rev. Joseph Hutton, at the time of the Chancery-suit, had been their pastor for upwards of fifty-six years, respected and beloved, an avowed Unitarian; and the Chancellor himself had publicly stated that there was satisfactory evidence of the congregation having held similar opinions for at least seventy-seven years. Within that time the congregation, by subscriptions and otherwise, had raised funds for the support of their ministers, and the widows of ministers, schools and almshouses, to the amount of £15,000, all of which, though admittedly raised by Unitarians, Sir E. Sugden expressed his fears that he could not sever from the original foundation, and therefore they must become the property of Trinitarians!

The case of Strand-Street congregation was very similar. Their house of prayer had been built by Unitarians, who had removed from a former site in 1762, and had had a succession of Unitarian ministers, one of whom was the father of the venerable Lord Plunket. In their instance, there was this peculiar feature of meditated wrong. The late Dr. Armstrong was much beloved by his congregation, and, from warm attachment to him, a fund was raised in 1809 by them, for the support of the widows of their ministers. Mrs. Armstrong, on the death of her husband, became entitled to the annuity thus created by Unitarian friends; but one of the objects which Mr. Mathews and his

party had in view, and which they were not ashamed to avow, was to rob this widow and her fatherless children of that very fund which had been raised specially for their support!

In neither of the congregations were there any doctrines or opinions expressed in their trust-deeds, or in any other documents connected with their properties. They had, from the very earliest period of their foundation, steadily rejected the bondage of all human creeds and confessions of faith, taking the Holy Scriptures alone as the rule of their faith and practice, and claiming and exercising the right of private judgment in their interpretation. They contended, therefore, that even although they might have departed from some of the opinions held by their ancestors at a very remote period, it was no more than the natural and legitimate consequence of unrestricted inquiry, no violation of the conditions on which their endowments had been given, nor the slightest departure from the principles on which their congregation had been founded. Notwithstanding all these averments, which were fully established, the stern dictum of the law, acting according to precedent rather than justice and humanity, was preparing virtually to eject their ministers, and to cast them forth in the evening and decline of life on the cold charity of the world,—to plunder the widow and her children, and to hand over the spoils to strangers who never had contributed to them one farthing,—and at the instance of a man who neither possessed nor pretended to any claim whatever on his own behalf, whose religion was hypocrisy, and who, like the arch traitor of old, would have betrayed the innocent and confiding with a kiss!

That I have neither misconceived nor misrepresented the purposes of the information, nor in the least exaggerated the evils with which we were threatened, is plain, from a letter in my possession, written by Mr. Mathews whilst the suit was in progress to a friend of mine, to be communicated to me; in which, after pointing out a certain course for me to follow, *with a view to the interests of my family*, he does not hesitate about the results, should I continue my opposition to him, concluding in these words,—"I need scarcely observe that a decree against him excludes him altogether from *every* fund (marked thus emphatically) belonging to the Munster Synod, and that he will no more be a member of it than you are." I treated with silent scorn this attempt to turn me aside from the course to which I had devoted myself, and to sacrifice the rights of the congregation of Eustace Street to my personal advantage.

In the mean time the Chancery-suit progressed, and the Chancellor at length intimated his opinion that he would in all probability find himself coerced to pronounce a decree against us, depriving us not only of all property that had descended from those held to be Trinitarians, but, according to the doctrine of accretions, even that which had been contributed by persons avowedly Unitarian! This calamitous opinion was expressed on Friday. On the following Sunday, whilst we were yet stunned by the unexpected and painful announcement, a communication was made *privately* to Mrs. Ledlie, through a friend, by Mr. Mathews, stating the evils that were impending over her and her family, including the loss of the Widows' Fund at my death, should I continue to resist, and urging her to persuade me to come to an arrangement that was both humiliating and dishonourable,

to save us from utter ruin. The time was chosen when our minds were likely to be most subdued, and woman's tenderness and woman's fears were strongly tested; but so far from yielding, or using her power to influence me to such a step, she firmly and unhesitatingly advised the very reverse, and cheered and supported me on the path of duty. We had but one heart and one mind; and taking counsel together, in humble dependence on that gracious Power "which clothes the flowers of the field and feeds the birds of the air," we resolved meekly to submit to the will of God, should poverty be our lot, but never to compromise our character.

In the mean time, the congregations of Eustace Street and Strand Street united their efforts with those of the other non-subscribing Presbyterians, to prevail on the Irish Government to withhold their countenance from this man, who, without even the pretext of personal injury or wrong, was involving a respectable and inoffensive religious community in the miseries of a protracted and ruinous litigation. We implored the authorities at the Castle of Dublin that the name of Her Majesty's Attorney-General might be withdrawn from the information, and the Relator, a junior clerk in their employment, left to his own unaided resources. The following petition, embodying a faithful statement of our grievances, was presented by a numerous and most respectable deputation of clergymen and laymen of our communion:

"To his Excellency, Thomas Philip, Earl de Grey, Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland.

"The Memorial of the Ministers and Congregations of Protestant Dissenters of the Presbyterian denomination meeting in Strand Street and Eustace Street, in the city of Dublin:

"Humbly sheweth,—That when the Act of Uniformity was passed, in the reign of Charles the Second, the predecessors and ancestors of your memorialists, descendants chiefly of English Nonconformists, felt themselves conscientiously obliged to separate from the Church established by law in this country, and to form themselves into religious societies for the purpose of worshiping God according to their convictions of duty. That from the formation of these societies down to the present day, they affirmed as a fundamental principle, and have uniformly and zealously maintained, the rejection of all creeds or articles of faith devised by uninspired men, and have adopted as the sole bond of their union, a belief in the Holy Scriptures and a conduct becoming the Gospel.

"That at a very remote period, these Christian societies erected places of worship in this city, and received various endowments from pious members of their body, for the maintenance of their religious teachers, and for other congregational purposes; which funds have been thus faithfully applied, some of them more than one hundred years. That your memorialists have strictly adhered to the original principles of their religious society, the sufficiency of Holy Scripture and the right of private judgment in interpreting it, and have at all times been distinguished for their loyal and peaceable behaviour, and their charitable disposition towards other sects. That after having remained long unmolested in the enjoyment of their religious privileges, countenanced and endowed by the State, and at peace with all men, they are now compelled to apply to your Excellency for protection against an aggression, which, under the forms of law, threatens to deprive them of the houses of worship built by their fathers; of the communion plate, from which they have so long commemorated the sufferings and death of their Redeemer; and all the funds handed down to them by former generations, and carefully preserved and augmented by themselves; to cast upon the world their ministers, some of

them now in the decline of life, who had justly reckoned on the continuance of a support from funds which had been so applied for upwards of a century; and to rob of their allotted provision the widow and the fatherless.

"That the pretext on which such proceedings have been grounded is, that your memorialists do not hold the same views of some religious questions that were held by their forefathers, in times long since past, and particularly, that they do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity as taught in the articles of the Church of England, and by the Westminster divines in the Standard of the Church of Scotland.

"That your memorialists rely upon this fact, that their pious predecessors and ancestors, from their uniform assertion of the great principles of religious freedom, and their resistance to all human impositions, never could have intended to erect their own opinions into a standard of unvarying belief during all succeeding times, and to deny to their descendants that liberty which they claimed and exercised themselves.

"That your memorialists do not hesitate to affirm, that the ministers and people of their respective congregations, at a very distant period, and before some of their most valuable endowments were created, steadily opposed the imposition of those very creeds, and questioned the truth of some doctrines contained in them; and that the doctrine of the Trinity, as expressed in those articles, was not then taught nor received in these congregations. That many of the funds now threatened were founded during the incumbency of men who held similar opinions on the leading questions in theology with the present ministers; and others were contributed by persons, some of whom are still living, and who assuredly never anticipated the present aggression, which is founded on the restrictions (long since happily removed) of a statute which limited toleration to those only who did not call in question a peculiar creed. That the persons ostensibly engaged in these proceedings have not and do not affect to have any claim to these meeting-houses and funds, being strangers, natives of Scotland, one of them a clerk in the Castle of Dublin, and the other two men in humble life residing in the county of Cork. That these men never have been members of either congregation, and have not been injured in any manner by the way in which the funds have been administered. That your memorialists have heard and believe that these proceedings are encouraged and supported by some members of the Church of Scotland and their associates in the General Assembly in this country, who, not satisfied with having embroiled themselves in an attempt to exalt and perpetuate ecclesiastical power at home, seem anxious to extend it to other districts, and to bring under their supervision and control religious communities that have uniformly resisted such authority; and would and will not suffer 'a yoke to be placed upon their necks which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear.'

"That there is not and never has been the slightest complaint on the part of any member of either congregation, or of any person in any way connected with them, of the mode in which the funds have been applied; and whilst serious injury and wrong are sought to be inflicted on your memorialists by this revival of religious persecution, the suppression of the attempt would not affect the rights or privileges of any one human being. That memorialists wish your Excellency particularly to observe, that the object of these proceedings, which are carried on in the name of Her Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland, is virtually to seek the interference of the civil power in depriving these two congregations (and by consequence all others exposed to similar litigation, amounting to more than thirty) of the ministers of their own choice; and not only so, but to impose restrictions on the liberty of choosing their ministers for the time to come; and that all such interference is an infringement of their fundamental and constitutional rights, coeval with Protestant Dissent itself; and that it is calculated to excite great alarm in all the Protestant Dissenters of this kingdom (whatever differences of religious opinion may exist among them), that the influence of the Crown should be directly

or indirectly exerted in the control of their internal affairs. Your memorialists therefore humbly and earnestly entreat that your Excellency, taking into consideration their claim of long and unquestioned possession — the total absence of all clauses in their deeds and leases restricting the enjoyment or application of their funds and houses to the support of any particular class of doctrinal opinions—the hardship and deep wounding of the feelings of the successors and lineal descendants of the founders and original occupants—the fact that the persons nominally claiming as Relators, have no real interest whatever—the bitterness of religious animosity that such proceedings will occasion in different parts of the country—together with the violent infringement of their Dissenting rights and privileges immediately attending and indirectly ensuing from these persecutions—will be graciously pleased to direct that the name of Her Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland be withdrawn from this procedure; and your memorialists will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

"Signed in the name and on behalf of the Ministers and Congregations of Strand Street and Eustace Street, Dublin.

JOSEPH HUTTON, A.M., T.C.D.,
Chairman of joint Committee of said Congregations."

A deaf ear was turned to our earnest supplications, and under the plea that the Attorney-General could not withhold his name in such a case, we were coolly handed over to the tender mercies of the law, to be plundered by a wandering adventurer from Scotland, who had wormed himself into office, and, with his hand in the public purse and overshadowed by the protection of the Castle, carried on an unequal and unrighteous contest with good and honourable men and peaceful subjects, who were struggling to maintain the privileges and endowments that had descended to them from their fathers. The Attorney-General for England had a different view of his duty, and, in a similar case, having refused his sanction, Mr. Mathews, the Relator, was compelled to discontinue his aggressions in that country. We hear much talk of the evils of centralization; and the citizens of Dublin have been from time to time seriously alarmed lest the office of Lord Lieutenant should be suppressed, and the duties of the Castle transferred to London. For my own part, after the experience I have detailed, I am inclined to think that the good might overbalance the evil in the change, and corruption, that moral nuisance, be thereby abated. Had our cause been left in the hands of the Irish Government after what we have seen and felt, and had there been no English supervision of the Irish public acts and accounts, I am fully persuaded that we should have been plundered hopelessly of all our congregational properties, and that Duncan Chisholm, battening upon them and other spoils within the Castle, would still have been upheld by his party as a *most religious man*, and Irish Boards of inquiry would have continued to declare, in the face of notorious and acknowledged facts, "*that he was a public servant of unimpeachable integrity*"!

The congregations of Eustace Street and Strand Street, together with their Northern brethren, unable to contend against the power which this man had strangely acquired with the local Government, and despairing of all relief at their hands, sent a deputation to London, and ultimately obtained from the Administration there that justice and humanity which were denied them at home.

Dublin, Nov. 12, 1851. J. C. LEDLIE, D.D.

(To be continued.)

THE REFORMED JEWS.*

A VOLUME of Sermons from the Synagogue is probably a sufficiently rare phenomenon to most of our readers, to possess no inconsiderable degree of interest for them. The present publication, however, offers a greater claim on our notice than is afforded by mere novelty. It expresses the doctrines, and seeks to justify the position, of a body of Jews to whom, we believe, the term *reformed* may with some propriety be applied. With the precise details of their separation from the rest of the Hebrew community we are not so fully acquainted, as to be able to undertake to state them to our readers; but the few particulars we gather from the volume before us we will briefly introduce. The Preface speaks of the twofold object of the publication of these discourses as being, first, to furnish Jewish families with the means of home instruction in the essentials of their faith; and, secondly, to set forth a fair exposition of the doctrines taught in the new Synagogue. The author speaks of misrepresentations made concerning their opinions and practices, and thinks that the best way of meeting such erroneous statements is by publishing discourses which actually exhibit the matter uniformly urged on his hearers.

The first sermon in the volume, delivered in the year 1842, is more particularly devoted to this service of stating the doctrines and defending the position of the new Synagogue. The animating spirit of its founders and supporters may be concisely described as one of reaction against mere formalism. The traditions and ceremonies of the Talmud, which some appear to exalt to an equal importance with the Mosaic Law itself, are regarded by the author and his friends as of very inferior value and authority; and in this point appears to consist the main difference between them and those from whom they have separated. The following passage shews us the light in which the former look upon the Talmud:

"Let it not be supposed that it is the intention of myself, or of any member of this congregation, whose humble organ I am, to impugn, in any way, the character of the traditional records. On the contrary, we recognize in them a valuable aid for the elucidation of many passages in Scripture; we feel proud of them as a monument of the zeal and mental activity of our ancestors; we hold it our duty to reverence the sayings of men, who, we are convinced, would have sacrificed their lives for the maintenance of that Law which God has vouchsafed to deliver unto us; but we must (as our conviction urges us) solemnly deny, that a belief in the *divinity* of the traditions contained in the Mishna, and the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, is of equal obligation to the Israelite with the faith in the divinity of the Law of Moses. We know that these books are human compositions; and though we are content to accept with reverence from our post-biblical ancestors advice and instruction, we cannot *unconditionally* accept their laws. For Israelites there is but one immutable Law—the sacred volume of the Scriptures, commanded by God to be written down for the unerring guidance of his people until the end of time."—P. 7.

The author maintains further, in the same discourse, the right of

---

* Sermons preached on various Occasions at the West-London Synagogue of British Jews. By the Rev. D. W. Marks, Minister of the Congregation. 8vo. Pp. 342. 1851.

each Hebrew congregation to "take such measures as shall bring the divine service into consistence with the will of the Almighty," as explained in the Law and the Prophets. He proceeds to consider imperfections and abuses which have crept into their public worship. He speaks of "Eastern customs totally at variance with the habits and disposition of an enlightened people," as having become associated with their religious practices. Among these is particularly specified the degradation of women below their proper station, involving as this does indifference for the religious instruction of females. Mr. Marks does not very clearly state to what he here refers, but he denounces the fact as an evil of a deplorable character, and protests against it. Another of the deprecated abuses consists in "the extreme length of the prayers, and in the blending with them of heterogeneous opinions and metaphysical disquisitions that can have no affinity with prayer. This renders it impossible to command the unwearied attention of the congregation during the entire service, and defeats every effort to excite devotion." We are further informed that an over-fondness for opinions and observances of bygone times characterizes, and has been detrimental to, modern Judaism; to such a degree is this the case, that many institutions originating in pure necessity "have been rigidly adhered to in our times, although the causes that produced them have long ceased to exist." Of these, the author instances the use of Chaldaic compositions in the Liturgy, introduced originally for the sake of those who did not understand Hebrew, and still retained when the Chaldee has become obsolete and the Hebrew is much better understood. He speaks also of the unseasonable hour at which the morning service commences, of an unbecoming levity occasioned during the reading of the Law, and of the want of pulpit instruction, as having assisted to depress Judaism and caused many to secede. It is to remedy these undoubtedly great and lamentable evils that the new Synagogue has been founded; the corresponding improvements to be introduced are described in the following passage:

"The time appointed for divine service is such as to enable the entire congregation, men, women and children, to assemble prior to the commencement of prayer. The prayers will be read aloud by the minister only; appropriate psalms and hymns will be chanted by the choir, and responses made by the congregation. The reading of the Law will not be interrupted by the Aliah, for as that institution has long lost its primary aim, the necessity for it no longer exists. Free-will offerings, unaccompanied by personal compliments, will be permitted in the Synagogue on the three festivals of Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles, as well as on such other days as occasions may require, after the book of the Law shall have been returned to the Ark. It will be incumbent upon children of both sexes, connected with this Synagogue, to be publicly confirmed in their faith at the age of thirteen years; the catechetical exercises joined with this important ceremony will embrace the whole of the principles of the Jewish faith. As prayer will be offered up in Hebrew only, and as it is indispensable that every Israelite should perfectly understand the supplications he addresses to the Supreme Being, I confidently hope that the sacred language will be generally cultivated by both sexes of this congregation. The holy festivals will be celebrated on those days *only*, commanded by God through our legislator Moses. The days commemorative of the great events of Jewish history will be duly observed."—Pp. 20, 21.

The main intention of the worshipers in the new Synagogue is evi-

dently one which deserves the sympathy and good wishes of their Christian countrymen. Their movement, so far as we can judge from these discourses, is one in the right direction—away from a cold, lifeless formalism, and towards that worship in spirit and in truth, which ONE whose name is never mentioned in this volume both practised and enjoined among his Jewish countrymen, in an age of equal or greater formalism, many centuries ago.

We have, in the foregoing remarks, selected a few points for notice, as shewing the origin and object of the new Jewish community, believing that these would probably be chiefly interesting to our readers, in these discourses. There are several additional topics, however, presented in the other sermons contained in the volume hardly less interesting or deserving of our notice, had we time to dwell at sufficient length upon them. We learn from these sermons somewhat of the doctrines and feelings of the more enlightened of the race of Israel, at the present day, in relation to several subjects of importance. We refer to the discourse in which it is maintained that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is taught in the Old Testament; to that on the final ingathering of Israel; and to that on the perpetuity and immutability of the Mosaic Law. In regard to each of these subjects, it may be expected that a Jewish writer will express the peculiar opinions of his people. On the first of the three, we think that the author shews, with considerable force and certainty, that the doctrine in question is to be traced in the later books of the Hebrew Scriptures; but that he fails in his endeavours to prove its existence in the earlier of the sacred writers. Many well-known passages are considered at length by Mr. Marks, some of which, we confess, it has surprised us to find here again brought forward, as of weight in favour of the author's position. We allude to such passages as Gen. v. 24, xxxvii. 35, xlix. 33; the obscure passage in Job xix. 25—27, which there is very strong reason to believe refers not to any hope on the part of Job of an existence after death, but to his beholding God, on the appearance of the Almighty towards the close of the book. That the doctrine of a resurrection existed among the later Jews, long previous to the introduction of Christianity, there can be no doubt; but the fact is equally undeniable that, whatever doubtful allusions to that doctrine occur in the later Hebrew books, there is nowhere in the Law or the Prophets, any clear, definite statement of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and that little or no practical use is made of such a doctrine, in any form of it. Compare, for illustration, the language of St. Paul on the subject in some of his Epistles,—the exultation in the divine hope to which he sometimes gives utterance,—and then it may be allowed that, for any practical purpose of religious impression, the doctrine can hardly be said to exist at all in the Old Testament. Far, however, be it from us to seek to deprive the author and those who think with him of the belief that their ancient and venerable Scriptures do authoritatively set forth the doctrine in question. We can easily understand and sympathize with the endeavour to shew that they do so, and that, consequently, the belief in the immortality of the soul possesses all the certainty which its inculcation in inspired writings of divine authority can give it. From these remarks it will be seen that we cannot allow all that the author seems, in the following words, disposed to claim for the Jews, apart from the Christians, as the medium of diffusing the doctrine of a future state:

"If this divine doctrine has been spread abroad to the ends of the earth, and inculcated in a manner worthy of the Deity, it must, in the first instance, be attributed to the Hebrews whom God chose to be His divine agents. Every exalted idea bearing upon a future state is borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptural records; and nothing has ever been advanced with regard to this doctrine, so as to recommend it to rational piety, which was not known to the Jews at the time when their Scripture Canon was closed."—P. 118.

If this statement were made of the great truths of the Divine Unity and moral government, we could very unreservedly assent to it. But we think the author misses the precise particular on which he might with correctness have advanced such a claim for his people, as benefactors and teachers of the world, and fixes upon one in regard to which he can by no means do so.

On the second of the three subjects above specified, the author's doctrine of the final ingathering of Israel is very distinctly stated. He thinks that the Scriptures speak of two restorations of the Jewish people; one being the return of the tribe of Judah from Babylon; the other the eventual restoration of every branch of the descendants of Abraham, including the ten tribes carried away by Shalmaneser. It is, he thinks, a great error to confound together the prophecies respecting these two events, as many do. In our author's opinion, it is not difficult to distinguish between them. One has already taken place; the other is still to come, and with the latter is to be connected the advent of the Messiah. The argument in proof, if such it may be called, is a scriptural one, and it appears to us to be greatly over-stated by the writer. He makes no allowance for the highly figurative language in which the prophets frequently speak. Because, he reasons, there are some things in what they declare respecting the restoration of their people which were not literally fulfilled in the return from Babylon, a second and more glorious restoration is still to come, in which such literal fulfilment will take place. This is the substance of the reasoning, of which we add, at length, one example, leaving our readers to form their own judgment as to the conclusion which is thought to be warranted:

"There is," we are told, "a remarkable passage which fully establishes the doctrine held by the house of Israel, that the advent of the Messiah, and the great ingathering of Judah and Israel, are to be synchronical events." The preacher then quotes at length Jeremiah xxiii. 3—7, and proceeds—"Here the prophet connects inseparably the restoration and the temporal prosperity of Israel with the Messiah's advent. That the restoration here predicted cannot refer to the Babylonian captivity is clear; since Jeremiah speaks of the gathering in of Israel 'out of all the lands where they are dispersed;' and further because Israel and Judah are mentioned conjointly. Besides which, the prophet teaches that such wondrous manifestations of God's providence are to attend the final ingathering of His people, as to surpass even the miracles performed in Egypt; and he adds that the departure from Egypt, which the Jews have never ceased to record in their praises to God, will not then be mentioned; but that the Israelites will address their Maker as the Lord, who hath restored the remnant of the long-lost tribes to their own soil. 'Therefore the time will come, saith the Lord, when they shall no longer say, The Lord liveth, who did bring up Israel's sons out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth who hath brought up and conducted the seed of the house of Israel from the north country, and from all the lands whereunto I have driven them; and they shall dwell upon their own soil.' (Jer. xxiii. 7, 8.) This prophecy has certainly not yet been fulfilled: of the remnant of the ten tribes

nothing for many centuries has been heard, upon which the mind can rest with any approach to certainty; and we Jews still continue to make the wondrous Exodus from Egypt a leading feature in all the prayers and praises which we address to the Almighty."—Pp. 198—200.

The author takes occasion, in connection with the above quoted passage in Jeremiah, to point out that the Jews do not expect that their Messiah will be a "divine person," as the expression, "the Lord our Righteousness," applied to him by the prophet, "has induced many persons to believe." And this he argues from the fact that "the very same words which some imagine to invest the Messiah with a divine character, are equally applied to the city of Jerusalem" (Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16).

The hope and belief which the author states and defends, as entertained by himself and his people, form certainly a very remarkable feature of modern Judaism. As ages roll on, and the Jews have been more widely dispersed and have become more closely identified in interest and feeling with the various nations among whom they live, the prospect of the realization of such anticipations would seem gradually to fade away into sheer impossibility. But not so, maintains the present intelligent preacher; and it is possible that the very existence of such a belief may ultimately, in some extraordinary way, bring about its own fulfilment. However this may be, we cannot but regard the expectation in question, so far as it claims to be founded on the Hebrew Scriptures, as altogether futile. The expressions supposed to justify it seem to us only to refer to the restoration from the ancient captivity in Babylon; and whatever may be the bright anticipations of prophets and poets of a glorious future for their nation, and the extension of their religion throughout the world, we must believe that their fulfilment in the establishment and diffusion of Christianity is the only, and the abundantly sufficient, fulfilment to which they are destined. So long, however, as the maintenance of this belief in the national ingathering and return of the Hebrews to the land of their forefathers does not lead them to feel less affection towards their present or adopted country, or to perform less effectually the duties of citizens and Englishmen, we can have no wish to deprive them of their cherished conviction. On this point the author is very explicit:

"On our actual social and political relations, however, the doctrine of our final ingathering does not exercise the slightest possible influence, because that event, as we believe, points to a time when the Lord will work a complete change in the principle of state government, and will annul the political constitution of every empire of the world. Though we confidently hope for the fulfilment of the prophecies that announce our restoration, and though we pray for their speedy accomplishment, because of the universal blessings which the predicted event will diffuse; still the sentiments which we cherish for our native land, as Englishmen and citizens, are no more affected by the doctrine of restoration, than are the sentiments of the large body of our non-Jewish compatriots by the doctrine which many of them maintain of the millennium. The believers in both doctrines may cherish their conscientious convictions, without suffering these varying articles of faith to weaken in the slightest degree their affection for their common country, or to diminish the ardent zeal which it becomes us all to manifest for our monarchical and other national institutions, and for the prosperity and glory of the British empire." P. 207.

In the discourse on the Revelation of Sinai and the perpetuity and immutability of the Mosaic Law, Mr. Marks states his belief in the literal perpetuity of the Law of Moses. "We cannot," he observes, "be said to be true disciples of Moses and faithful followers of our ancestors at Sinai, unless we hold firmly and inviolably, that no article of the Sinaic Covenant can ever be altered or superseded, and that no dogma which is not there set forth in its plain and obvious sense, can ever be entitled to our religious belief. When the Jew speaks of the divine revelation, he of course understands by that term, the whole Mosaic Law, as I shall now proceed to shew" (p. 281). There is much want of definiteness, and some narrowness of view, as it appears to us, in this discourse; but of course we are not eager to found strictures on vague, general expressions about the importance and unchangableness of the old Levitical law. Changed enough it is, as observed by the Jew of our age, whatever may be the assertion or the boast of its immutability! What concerns us more is the charitable and tolerant spirit which, along with his adherence to the Law of Moses, the author so clearly manifests. He proudly claims as "born of the Jew and reared by the Jew," the precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and earnestly seeks to recommend it to his hearers, as expressive of the true character of their religion.

The remaining discourses of the volume we can only characterize in general terms. They are, for the most part, but slight in structure, each being founded on some incident or expression of the Scriptures, to the exposition of which some considerable space is devoted. We have not observed any attempt at polemical discussion; there is hardly a reference to Christianity, and no defence of Judaism, as against the objections of Christians. The preacher addresses himself to the practical circumstances, and ordinary feelings and wants, moral and religious, of his hearers. The thoughts to which he gives utterance are usually sufficiently obvious, not to say commonplace; while his creed is a somewhat strict and narrow one. It embraces the maintenance of the divine authority and inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures, the perpetuity of Judaism, the lasting obligation on the part of the Jew to perform, so far as possible, the rites of his religion, and to marry only within the limits of his own race. With all this, the more peculiarly Jewish element, is united much that is truly excellent and comprehensive in spirit; the doctrine that "we have all one Father," and of consequent love towards all our fellow-men, without distinction of race or faith; the duty of prayer; the necessity of repentance and sorrow for sin; the belief in immortality;—such are the moral and religious principles and duties inculcated in these sermons. The volume is, we believe, a very favourable exhibition of modern Judaism; and, we must add, it appears to us to exemplify in some degree the reflex influence—unacknowledged, indeed, but yet real and important—the reflex influence of Christianity in softening, elevating and spiritualizing the older faith from which it sprung.

We would, in conclusion, commend these discourses to those who think that the Jew is unfit to be admitted to share the full political rights and privileges of the Englishman. And such persons we would remind of all that we Christians owe to the people to whom we now refuse participation in our national birthright. Let us not be un-

grateful to that once distinguished nation, which has been the instrument of rendering such conspicuous services to the human race. Think of the influence which the ancient Jewish mind has exercised over our European and Christian civilization, during centuries of the past. Think how the hymns, and praises, and prayers, and denunciations of iniquity, and outpourings of pious hope and trust in God, given to us by their prophets and poets, have been, with all devout men, for ages past, as household and familiar things. Think in how many a case the examples of their history and the wisdom of their laws have inspired, instructed and encouraged the men of later days; how their Scriptures have been read and reverenced more widely and more deeply than any other similar book, or collection of books, within our knowledge. Even our Christian Testament is Jewish in its origin, contents and character, written by Hebrew men, under the influence of Hebrew forms of life and thought; and Jesus himself, our prophet, priest and king in spiritual things, was a descendant of Abraham. Let us remember, thus, what we Christians owe to this people; and let us, at the same time, not forget what has been the return for it all which Christian nations have so commonly made to them, or their descendants, in their outcast and despised condition during bygone centuries. Let us ponder upon all this; and then we may find cause, perhaps, to wonder at that strange obliquity of feeling and judgment, which would now refuse to this race a free participation with us in our social and political privileges and rights,—as if, indeed, this were not eminently due to them at our hands, in acknowledgment and return for the inestimable blessings which we have received from and through them.

MR. RUSSELL'S PROPOSED SOCIETY FOR UNITARIAN MINISTERS.

SIR,

I FEEL that it would be ungracious in me not to reply to the letter signed Justitia in the last No. of the Christian Reformer. The spirit in which it is written calls for my warmest thanks, and encourages me to hope that, with such kind assistance, the object we both have in view may be accomplished. I am by no means wedded to my plan in particular, and if a better can be suggested I shall most gladly lend my assistance in carrying it out, or I shall be equally willing to modify the one proposed in any way that shall appear to make it more acceptable. Of the necessity for the formation of some such Society I am more than convinced by facts which have been communicated to me in a correspondence in which I am at present engaged with the ministers. I avail myself of this opportunity of cordially thanking them, not only for the confidence reposed in me, but also for the expressions of kind feelings towards me which many of their letters contain.

The writer of the letter signed Justitia will, I trust, excuse my saying that I dislike the expression, "benevolently intended *charitable* Institution." I have had other expressions applied to my proposal, which I must be allowed to say had better have been withheld; and I fear we shall not make much successful progress in any plan until we give up using such expressions. I ask nothing as a boon. I acknowledge a heavy debt of gratitude and justice, and I seek for the means, if not of repaying that debt, at least of preventing its increase.

As I shall probably have occasion to address the Unitarian body more fully upon this subject early in the ensuing year, I shall not pursue it farther upon the present occasion—and remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

Birmingham, Nov. 21, 1851. JAMES RUSSELL.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Chronicle of Battel Abbey, now first translated by Mark Antony Lower, M.A. London—R. Smith. 1851.

This well-executed book offers materials of a very interesting character to such as wish to study the history of England below the surface. Monkish chroniclers are often blamed for the dryness and inutility of their narratives. Scarcely can such a fault be imputed to the author or authors of this Chronicle of Battel Abbey. Relating as it does to the great events accomplished by William the Conqueror, the book introduces the reader to historical transactions and historical personages of the highest importance, and indirectly affords pictures of English life and manners which are no less interesting than curious. These pictures, however, relate to the outer life of the great ones of the world, rather than to the retired and inner life of the monastery and the cell, and, so far as they turn to spiritual matters, speak mainly of the disagreements and quarrels of rival churchmen, and very little of the virtues and graces which adorn and bless private life. Among the numerous lessons which may be learnt from the Chronicle, not least striking is that which teaches us that, powerful as was the Church in "the dark ages," the Throne was supreme. Had Cardinal Wiseman made his descent on England in the days of the Conqueror or his immediate successors, he would have been more rudely encountered than by an ill-tempered letter or a nugatory Act of Parliament. In a law-suit between the Abbot of Battel and the Bishop of Winchester, in which appeal was made to the King (Henry II.), the Bishop, pleading his cause in the royal presence, declared that no ecclesiastic could be deposed without the Pope's permission. "It is quite true," interposed Henry, "a Bishop cannot be *deposed;* but by outstretched hands he may be *expelled.*" The merriment which the gibe called forth from the courtiers, and the issue of the controversy in the condemnation of the Bishop, shew very clearly that these were no idle words. Much, however, depended on the character of individuals. Even the monarch was unable to stand against a priest endowed with strength of character and firmness of will. This fact is illustrated in the final issue of the contest which the same sovereign carried on against Thomas à Becket. The reader may be instructed as well as interested in perusing the sacerdotal account of that event. Thomas à Becket had been very pliable to the King's will, and had rendered essential service in the quarrel just adverted to between the Abbot of Battel and the Bishop of Winchester. By these things he had raised himself to the high office of Chancellor of the realm, then always filled by an ecclesiastic.

"While he held the office of Chancellor, he was, after the King, among the distinguished the most eminent, among the powerful the mightiest, and among the Monarch's intimates the most familiar. The King on this account exerted himself by every means to promote him to the dignity of Archbishop of Canterbury, which is reckoned the highest ecclesiastical post in the realm. For he calculated that from their long-standing intimacy he would yield to him in all things, and on no occasion whatever oppose his wishes. But while he proposed this, God saw fit to dispose far otherwise. For the venerable Thomas, having attained this elevated position, thought more of the obligations than of the honour it imposed upon him; more of the weight of the pastoral charge than of the temporal dignity. 'Honours,' in his case, according to the vulgar proverb, 'changed behaviour' indeed, not according to the experience of most men, for the worse, but day by day for the better; for 'putting off the old man which is according to the world,' he sought to 'put on the new man which is created according to God' (Ephes. iv. 22).

"Meanwhile the King began to wish to oppress the clergy, demanding for that purpose the assent of the Archbishop and his suffragans. But while the Bishops consented, the Archbishop refused to do so, regarding himself as the

defender of the church and not its opponent. The King, therefore, with the Bishops and chief men of the realm, burnt against him with such great indignation, that their ancient friendship went for nothing in comparison with this newly-conceived hatred. The Archbishop nevertheless stood firmly by the church, though unsupported. All thus opposing him, and no one espousing his cause, he could do little or nothing, and seeing one danger succeed another, he chose rather to undergo a voluntary exile than to see the church endangered before his face. He therefore snatched himself from the midst of such iniquity, and went over to France, to seek in a foreign land that peace which he had not in his own. He retired in poverty, destitute of his property and possessions, and was immediately deprived by the hand of power of the revenues arising from them. How many sufferings he underwent in the six years of his exile, could be expressed by no one but himself, because no one else had them to experience. Among the innumerable injuries shamefully heaped upon him, the most abominable was, that when in his own person he was beyond reach, a violent hatred was excited against all his kindred; inasmuch that all who were his relatives and well-wishers were adjudged to banishment with him, that if anything were wanting to his own sufferings, it might be fulfilled in theirs. It was a miserable sight, when neither age, nor sex, nor condition was spared by this shocking cruelty, when women with child, and little ones hanging at the breast, with young men, and aged persons supporting their weakly limbs with a staff, were thus driven forth.

"When the seventh year of his exile had commenced, the King pretended to have received him again into his favour, and upon the strength of this seeming reconciliation, exchanging his exile for his native land, he returned peacefully to England. On his arrival, he proceeded to the church of his primacy, relying upon the promise of peace, which however was not fulfilled. For he had been settled scarcely a month in his church, when four knights coming—I do not say *sent*—from the royal court, attacking him, this pastor of the church, in the church and for the church, was slain by men regenerated in Christ and in the church, though now, for the commission of this monstrous crime, alienated from the church. The report of this enormous wickedness ran swiftly through the land, and crossed the seas, while its cry ascended from earth to heaven; and it was soon manifested by numerous shining miracles in all directions, that this Primate had died the death of a martyr.

"In the mean time this martyr of the Lord, or rather the Lord himself on behalf of his martyr, seemed to seek revenge for his innocent blood; for the prince, the King's son, rebelled against his father, and receiving the sanction and aid of many of the barons, endeavoured to drive him from his kingdom. He was, therefore, deprived of all counsel and solace. On one side, an angry conscience accused him of his wickedness; on the other, an inevitable danger threatened him; for while his fleet was upon a foreign shore, his son, with an immense army, appeared ready to seize upon his kingdom.

"Placed in this dilemma, he learned a lesson of humility, and laying aside his fierceness, speedily went to Canterbury. Approaching the city barefoot, he sought the martyr's sepulchre, confessed his guilt; he sought pardon, and promised fruits worthy of repentance. The Lord, with his martyr, mindful of his accustomed mercy, did not delay to afford it to the humbled monarch, for he sent a sudden fear into the hearts of his enemies, so that they immediately desisted from their purpose, and retreated from the seas which they had prepared to cross."—Pp. 156—159.

The Journal of Sacred Literature: New Series. Edited by John Kitto, D.D., F.S.A. No. I. October, 1851. London—R. B. Blackader.

Dr. Kitto, whose great services to Biblical literature are well known and universally acknowledged, has commenced a New Series of his Quarterly Journal, and so afforded an opportunity for the accession of new subscribers. That Journal, in being devoted to theological and scriptural topics all but exclusively, has a ground of its own, and asks the support of all theological and scriptural students. The works which the editor has given to the public, as well as his deep and varied learning and well-earned reputation, afford a guarantee of the sound scholarship to be expected in his Journal; which has

also this recommendation, that it presents in its articles advanced views of theological science, and in its intelligence the most recent information on the subject, as it exists, not in England only, but in foreign countries, especially in Germany and the United States. Among the articles in this first number of the New Series, we have been struck with that which offers a new explanation of the taxing or census mentioned in Luke ii. 1—5. Of errors held to be here involved, Strauss and writers of a similar kind have made free use in order to invalidate the evangelical history. The writer of the essay attempts to wrest the weapon out of their hands. Should the voice of the learned world declare its assent to the view he takes, he will have the satisfaction of feeling that he has rendered a service to Christianity of no small kind; for hitherto, amid great varieties of opinion, no explanation has found universal acceptance. The new view here put forth is, that Luke, in the Gospel and in the Book of Acts, intended to speak of one and only one census, the commencement of which he records in the first book of his history, the Gospel, and its conclusion in the second book of the same general work, namely, what is commonly, but scarcely with accuracy, called "The Book of the Acts of the Apostles." The census, so far as mentioned in the Gospel, was suddenly interrupted, and not carried to its completion until the time when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. This sense the writer finds in the Greek of the Gospel, the simple and exact rendering of which, he contends, gives the meaning which he ascribes to the Scripture, and which sets Luke in full accordance with himself and with history. Leaving the value of the new view to the judgment of Biblical scholars, we may add, that the essay well deserves a careful perusal, if only as offering a feasible solution of a scriptural difficulty hitherto felt to be of no small magnitude and no inconsiderable importance.

Footsteps of our Forefathers: what they suffered and what they sought. By James G. Miall. With Thirty-six Engravings. Pp. 368. London—Cockshaw.

This is a very interesting book, and a valuable addition to popular Nonconformist literature. In twelve chapters Mr. Miall sketches with a bold hand, and in a style rich in picturesque beauty, the story of Wickliff, the early English Puritans, Hampden, the early Independents, Cromwell, the Bartholomean Confessors, the early Quakers, the Scotch Covenanters, John Bunyan, Defoe, Matthew Henry, and Philip Doddridge. The whole is executed with exemplary fairness. The exaggerated claims of Independents are equitably adjusted; the shortcomings and inconsistencies of reformers and other friends of liberty are rebuked; the virtues of Laud and other tyrants are not forgotten in the recital of their crimes. We heartily recommend every Nonconformist parent to put this volume into the hands of his children, if he wishes them to know the price which has been paid by his forefathers for the civil and religious liberty they now enjoy,—and every Nonconformist minister to place it on the shelves of his vestry library, if he wishes his flock to be able to give good reasons for their Nonconformity.

The Church of England in the Reigns of the Stuarts. London—Cockshaw.

This is a sequel to the excellent sketch of the History of the Church of England in the Reigns of the Tudors which we noticed lately with commendation. It gives us some admirable passages, well applied, from the writings of Hallam, Macaulay and Carlyle, and is so well composed, and tells its tale so clearly, that it cannot but promote the principles of Nonconformity and religious liberty.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Western Unitarian Society.

The annual meeting of the above Society was held at Gloucester, on Wednesday, October 22. The proceedings commenced with a service in Barton-Street chapel. It was opened by the Rev. Henry Solly, of Cheltenham. The sermon was preached by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., of Manchester. The text was taken from Job xxxii. 8. The reverend gentleman commenced by referring to the action and reaction constantly going on in the views held by mankind or a large section of society at different periods, and pointed out the source of that low estimate of human nature and that exalted view of the sacred Scriptures, which arose with the Reformation in Germany. He spoke of the theory of salvation, by which an explanation was furnished for the evidently inoperative effects here and there of the primeval fall, whose awful consequences were in other cases deemed so clear and remarkable. Mr. Tayler then combated these orthodox views as disproved alike by reason, history and experience; and urged, in a most impressive and touching manner, as at once necessary on spiritual and logical grounds, and practically proved also by experience, that morality and religion, the desire for goodness, for purity and holiness of life, for inward peace and the approval and love of heaven, has its source in the human soul. In this part of his discourse, the preacher appealed to the frequently-cited cases of extreme depravity and corruption, where the tender hand of piety and affection has drawn the clear signs of a spirit still yearning for purity and heavenly love from the deep-encrusted core of the degenerate heart; and he asked whence the change could come, the sorrow and the aspiration, and the germ of a new life arise, if not from within. The view taken of the Scriptures by the early reformers as the antidote to human corruption was next considered, and a value attached to them which, however much lower, seemed to rest on a much firmer basis of reason and reality. The preacher's view was that, in consistency with the general economy of Providence, by constitution and character the Hebrew people had been from the earliest times the natural conservators of the religious element of human culture, as the Greeks, e. g., of the intellectual element; that among the Hebrews the prophetic character had ever been more frequently found and more marked and influential than in any other nation;—by the prophetic character was meant that moral and religious nature peculiarly susceptible, alike through instinct and feeling and thought, of every obligation of duty, and every rise or influx of holy aspiration and desire. The concluding portion of the discourse (which was particularly enjoyed and admired by all) was an eloquent expression of the ever-increasing value attached by the speaker for the sacred records of scripture, as the deepest and purest sources of peace and solace, strength, aspiration and delight.

The service being concluded, the regular business of the Society commenced. Charles Washbourne, Esq., was called to the chair; and the report being read and received, and thanks voted to the officers, who were re-appointed, the thanks of the meeting were then cordially given to the Rev. J. J. Tayler for his very able and suggestive discourse. Several earnest expressions of approval and admiration were elicited from gentlemen present, and, on the suggestion of the Rev. William James, of Bristol, the Society were recommended by the assembled friends to obtain the preacher's consent to the sermon being printed. This, like the other resolutions, was carried unanimously. Mr. Tayler expressed himself for several reasons unwilling to publish the discourse, but would postpone his decision for the present. A few members were then elected; amongst others, Kershaw Lumb, Esq., of Cheltenham, and Mrs. Lumb. The Rev. H. Solly then proposed that the Society should invite the Western Unitarian Christian Union to co-operate with it in disseminating its tracts and other publications, by offering a supply of the same, and declaring itself willing to share any contingent expenses. Mr. Solly spoke of the desirableness of a missionary being employed for this purpose by the Western Union, upon which a discussion arose as to whether it would lie within the proper objects of the Society to aid in such a work. But as all present seemed to agree in the rationality and wisdom of the proposition, no fur-

ther objection was made. The Rev. G. B. Brock, of Swansea, seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously. The Rev. G. Armstrong then proposed, and the Rev. J. H. Hutton seconded, a resolution to address Louis Kossuth on his arrival in England, in token of their sympathy and high esteem. This proceeding being declared to be out of order, on the suggestion of the Rev. W. James, the business meeting was first concluded by a vote of thanks to the Chairman. The friends of the Society there present then formed themselves into a special meeting, and the resolution was again brought forward and carried unanimously. Upon this subject, one of the speakers, G. P. Hinton, Esq., of Bristol, became so animated in his declamations against Austrian tyranny and lawless rule, that it was thought necessary to call him to order, as the meeting was being held in the chapel, an unfit place, it was urged, for political harangues. A committee was appointed to draw up an address, and the meeting then broke up.

At half-past three o'clock, about sixteen gentlemen sat down to dinner in a spacious room at the Spread Eagle Hotel. The entertainment was most excellent. William Price, Esq., (late High Sheriff of the county) presided; and, when the cloth was removed, proposed, with remarkable tact, ease and good taste, the healths successively of the Queen and Prince Albert, with the rest of the Royal Family. The success of the Western Unitarian Society was then proposed by Alfred Price, Esq., and responded to by the Secretary, Christopher J. Thomas, Esq., of Bristol. Mr. Tayler's health was then proposed from the chair. Mr. Tayler, in acknowledging the compliment, expressed his conviction that if he and his brethren of the North had the pleasure of meeting more frequently their brethren in the South, they would mutually perceive that their differences were not fundamental, and that their sympathies were strong and warm. Civil and Religious Liberty was the next toast, to which the Rev. G. Armstrong cordially responded. The Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham, then rose to propose a toast, and in a most graceful and expressive manner, with peculiar appropriateness, he begged those around him to drink to the health of his old friend the Rev. John Kentish, who had so nobly consecrated his learning and wealth and wisdom to the Christian ministry. After the good wishes of the Society had been offered to the Unitarian minister and congregation of Gloucester, and to the Rev. Henry Solly on his departure from the neighbourhood, and to the Rev. John Dendy on his settlement at Cheltenham, and severally acknowledged, the gentlemen adjourned to the chapel, where the Rev. G. B. Brock, of Swansea, delivered a long and able and powerful discourse on the Protestant principle, which, carried out in its integrity, must lead, he maintained, to Unitarianism.

Congregational Meeting at Wakefield.

The Presbyterian congregation assembling at Westgate chapel, Wakefield, held their annual social meeting on the evening of Monday, Nov. 10. It was the anniversary of the opening of the fine suite of school-rooms which were completed about twelve months back. The buildings comprise two good school-rooms and a spacious lecture-room, all fitted up with educational drawings, maps and diagrams of the best description. The grounds are laid down with much taste, and at the entrance a very convenient dwelling has been built for the chapel-keeper. The whole has cost upwards of £1100, and reflects great credit upon the zeal of the congregation and on the munificence of Daniel Gaskell, Esq., of Lupset Hall, the generous donor not only of the land and buildings out of which the schools were constructed, but of a large subscription besides. The school, under the able management of Mr. See, has proved self-supporting, and is conferring great advantages upon the youth of Wakefield. The Sunday-school is increasing in numbers and efficiency, having recently received an important addition to the staff of its managers and conductors in the family of Mr. and Mrs. Briggs, late of Overton. The school fund being in a very prosperous condition, Rev. Edward Higginson and his congregation determined this year to appropriate the sermons and the collection to Manchester New College, an institution which has received from the Wakefield congregation steady and generous support since the year 1804, when the Rev. Chas. Wellbeloved preached a sermon in the chapel on behalf of the College, then removed to York. The duty of advocating the claims of the institution was this year entrusted to Rev. R. Brook Aspland, one of the Secretaries of the College, who on Sunday morning, Nov.

9th, preached a sermon on the sufficiency of Scripture, with a reference to the present state of opinion in England, and an attempt to estimate the value of tradition, articles, creeds, intuitions, the inner light, and other substitutes for Scripture resorted to by religious bodies or individuals. In conclusion, the preacher shewed that respect for Scripture and the rights of private judgment had been the guiding principle of the founders and conductors of Manchester New College, and that it had done good service to literature, morals, philanthropy and religion. A collection was made amounting to rather more than £15.—The tea-party on the following day was a very spirited and successful meeting, at which were gathered together the minister and most of the members of the congregation, and as guests, Rev. Wm. Turner, Jun., Rev. Charles Wicksteed, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. J. Owen, Rev. J. K. Montgomery, &c. The party assembled in the lecture and large school rooms, the neat and ornamental appearance of which,—so different from the untidy and uninviting features of many school-rooms,—seemed well suited to the festive occasion. The chair was taken and ably filled by Thomas Todd, Esq., of Dewsbury, whose addresses throughout the evening on the several subjects discussed were strictly appropriate and very happy. In the crowded state of our pages we cannot give any detailed report of the meeting. It may be sufficient to state two or three of the more important matters discussed. Mr. Aspland illustrated the important services rendered to civil and religious liberty by the English Nonconformist Academies, and illustrated his remarks by a sketch of the life of Mr. Frankland, one of the earliest Nonconformist tutors, from whose academy at Rathmell had proceeded the first minister of the Wakefield congregation, Mr. Sagar. Mr. Wicksteed, in a speech characterized by all his accustomed felicity of idea and expression, gave a sketch of the rise and growth and influence of the periodical literature of England. In speaking of the periodicals in which the Unitarian body were chiefly interested, the *Christian Reformer*, the *Prospective Review* and the *Inquirer*, he alluded to the presence and cordial mutual regard of those who were sustaining or had sustained the office of their Editors, and dwelt with much effect on the superiority of all of them to mere pecuniary considerations. It never crossed their minds what would promote the sale of their respective works, but their sole desire was to put forth what they believed to be true, instructive and useful. Some of the speeches naturally fell into the channel of education, and Mr. Higginson, Mr. Wicksteed, Mr. Henry Briggs, Mr. Wilderspin and Mr. Cannon, discussed (and the discussion was the more interesting from there being some little diversity of opinion) both the general principles and some of the practical details of education. The West-Riding Domestic Mission was not forgotten, and much gratification was felt by the friends present when the announcement was made of an important practical, and it may be hoped lasting, result from the operations of the Society in the intended establishment of a chapel and school-room at Idle, which has been made very judiciously, as the result proves, the chief seat of the labours of Mr. Squire, the missionary. Mr. Squire is invited to undertake the settled ministry here. Though the immediate effect will be the loss to the Mission of his services and some local diminution of subscriptions, the friends of the Mission will be encouraged to proceed with renewed earnestness and increased hope in their important work of christianizing and evangelizing the hard-headed working men of the West Riding. Mr. Ryland touched on a string which appeared to vibrate through the meeting when he alluded to the sufferings and character of Kossuth, the Hungarian Patriot. Mr. Marshall offered an energetic tribute to the character of their friend and benefactor, Mr. Daniel Gaskell. Much gratification was felt by the presence of the venerable Rev. Thomas Johnstone, the assistant and successor of Rev. William Turner in the Wakefield pulpit. In the course of the evening he detailed some of his recollections of former days, including his intercourse with Dr. Price, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham.

No portion of the proceedings of the evening appeared to excite greater interest than a speech of the Chairman towards the close, in which he expressed his own feeling, and the feelings of the congregation generally, towards their indefatigable and highly-gifted pastor, Rev. Edward Higginson. In token of the depth and universality of the feeling, he announced that steps had just been taken to render the min-

ister's salary more commensurate with the zeal and ability of his services. We mention this fact with great satisfaction, as one of the first intimations of a move, which we hope will become general amongst our congregations, towards increasing the remuneration of their pastors. Such a step has become necessary, owing to the altered habits of the middle classes of society in England, and to the diminished sources of income open to Dissenting ministers from the education of youth. Without this, and probably other plans too being early adopted, the future of our Presbyterian and Unitarian societies is cloudy and uncertain, and it will be scarcely reasonable to expect that a continuous supply of well-educated ministers can be found to carry on the services of the one or two hundred congregations of liberal Dissenters in Great Britain. The subject has been discussed in our pages, and handled with great ability in the columns of our excellent contemporary, the *Inquirer*. We wish it were in our power to give the manly, sensible and warm-hearted, but perfectly independent, remarks uttered by Mr. Higginson when he rose to acknowledge the unexpected token of the affection of his flock. From first to last, the proceedings of the evening gave satisfaction and delight. On the following morning, the ministers met as a Committee of the West-Riding Mission.

Bolton District Unitarian Association.

The autumn half-yearly meeting was held at Hindley, Nov. 6, 1851, having been postponed a month in consequence of the Queen's visit to Lancashire. The religious services were conducted by Rev. J. Whitehead and Rev. Francis Knowles, the latter of whom preached a useful discourse from Philippians i. 18, on the Christian spirit in the midst of sects and parties.

At the evening meeting, after tea, Dr. Beard, of Manchester, was called to the chair, and gratified a numerous party by an account of the opening of a new chapel near Ashton-under-Lyne, and of a contemplated new chapel at Rawtenstall. Many gentlemen present, as well as the Chairman, spoke at length in reference to the theological aspects of the Christian world, and more particularly to the means of meeting the religious wants of the times. In the course of the proceedings, Mr. Ragland read an appeal, intended to be made public, in behalf of the Unitarian chapel and Sunday-school at Hindley, both of which stand in need of repairs and enlarged accommodation. This appeal received the sanction of the meeting. The condition of the Sunday-schools in the district was represented to be improving. At Walmsley, new schools are in the course of erection, and it is expected that they will be completed in time for the reception of the friends who attend the next half-yearly meeting, which will take place there on the last Thursday of April in the ensuing year. The Rev. James Whitehead will preach on the occasion, and the Rev. Franklin Howorth will take the introductory services in the chapel.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 7, at the New Gravel-Pit meeting-house, Hackney, by Rev. John Boucher, Frank Titford, of Greenwich, to Maria S. Bidlake, of De Beauvoir Road, Kingsland.

Oct. 8, at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., William, son of Peter Eckersley, Esq., Wilton Polygon, Crumpsall, to Mary Louisa, daughter of John Shawcross, Esq., of Woodland Terrace, Broughton.

OBITUARY.

Oct. 1, at her residence, Trebanos, near Swansea, Glamorganshire, greatly and generally respected, Miss Sarah Rees, the youngest and last surviving daughter of the late Rev. Josiah Rees, of Gelligron, in the same county.

Oct. 5, at Fredericton, New Brunswick, Mary Ann, wife of the Hon. James Carter, Chief Justice of the province.

Oct. 16, after long illness, Elizabeth Edney, daughter of the late Mr. John Edney, and granddaughter of Mr. John Marsom.

GENERAL INDEX.

Act of Parliament relating to Chapel Trusts, 703.
Actonian Prize (T. Wharton Jones), 674.
Acts ix., 294—x., 368.
Advertising for ministers rebuked, 372.
Ainsworth, Mr., of Cleator, 506, 566, 637. His scholarship, 637.
Alderley parish and Bishop Stanley, 164.
Alexander's, Mr., lectures at Belfast, 236.
Alms-dish, the, 186.
Althorpe, visit to, 673.
American Slavery, 437, 483, 537, 585, 650, 717.
Ancient Britons, a Tale, 691.
Anti-sectarianism, 235, 630.
Apostolical succession, 173.
Apples, bitter, of Sodom, 577, 715.
Argyle's, Duke of, Twofold Protest, 623.
Armstrong's, Rev. G., letter to Western Union, 188. Spirit of the Churches, 565.
Ashton's, Rev. J., Address to his Congregation, 245.
Aspland, Rev. R. B., 63, 638, 760.
Atkinson's Letters on Man's Nature, 193.

Bache, Rev. S., 61. His Sermon on the Eclipse, 627.
Bacon, Mr., of Gloucester, &c., 46.
Bacon's, Lord, Idola, 196.
Baines, Edward, Life of, 600.
Balls, Mr. W., obituary of, 384.
Barmby, Goodwyn, 183.
Battel Abbey, Chronicle of, 756.
Bayley's, Rev. J., Address, 117.
Beard's, Dr., Illustrations of Divine in Christianity, 38. Biographical Dictionary, 117, 434.
Beard's, Rev. C., Sermon at Knutsford, 311.
Belfast lectures, 236.
Belper, lectures at, 316.
Bengal Civilian's Inquiry into the Faith, 556.
Bentley and Le Clerc, 24.
Berry's, Rev. C., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 116.
Beth, lines by, 201, 217, 429, 482, 536.
Bible, the, the Koran, and the Vedas, 57.
Biddle, John, 417.
Birkenhead Unitarian chapel, 576, 632.
Birmingham Brotherly Society, 123.
Bishop's, Mr., Domestic Mission Report, 242. Sermon at provincial meeting, 435. Speech, 438.
Bishops bad political cobblers, 614.
Blackley's Teachers' Manual, 433.
Blackmore Papers, 413.
Blackmore, Rev. William, 413.
Blackmore, Chewning, 428.
Blomfield, Bishop of London, anecdote of, 168.
Bohn's Standard Library, 498.
Bolton District Unitarian Association, 381, 762.
Booth, Catherine, obituary of, 125.
Boucher's, Mr., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 58.
Boucher, Joan, 303.
Boult, Mrs., obituary of, 704.
Bowman, Mrs., obituary of, 320.
Bright, Benjamin Heywood, 27.
Bristol, rise of Nonconformity in, 43.
British Quarterly Review, 561.
Broadhurst, Rev. Thomas, obituary of, 704.
Broadmead Records, 43.
Bulfinch's Communion Thoughts, 60.
Bunsen, Chevalier, 25.
Bunyan, John, 184.
Burgh on the Trinity, 396.

C. on the No-Popery agitation, 1. On novels and novel-writers — Dickens and Thackeray, 208. On Life of Wordsworth, 351. Correspondence of Walpole and Mason, 386.
Cæsar, Julius, 299.
Caleb Field, reviewed, 470.
Calvert, Dr., Warden of Manchester, 26.
Calvin and Servetus, 300.
Canne, John, 45.
Carleton, Guy, Bishop of Bristol, 49.
Carmarthen College, 572.
Carpenter, Rev. R. L., on American Slavery, 483, 537, 585, 650, 717. Monotessaron of the Gospels, 495.

Carpenter's, Miss, Meditations, 303.
Carpenter, Rev. Benjamin, 533.
Carter, Mrs., obituary of, 762.
Ceylon, Christianity in, 257.
Channing, Dr., Memoir of, 187, 430.
Chapman's, Rev. E., Domestic Mission Sermon, 43, 57.
Chatterton and Walpole, 393.
Cheltenham, 637.
Cheshire Presbyterian Association, 310.
Chesterfield, Lord, 392.
Chewning family, 426.
Christian Tract Society, 507.
Church, what it should be, 376.
Church of England, 630. In the Reigns of the Tudors, 496. In the Reigns of the Stuarts, 758.
Church of Rome, 630.
Church laws in England, 549.
Clayton, Dr. Nicholas, 527.
Cleator, religious services at, 506. School, 566.
Clephan, Mrs., obituary of, 192.
Cogan, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Coleman, Rev. Thomas, 415.
Coleridge, Hartley, 668.
Coleridge's visit to Nottingham, 529.
Colfox, Miss, obituary of, 125.
Collins, Anthony, 618.
Colossians i. 17—19, 282—ii. 16, 647—iii. 3, 648.
Colthurst, Rev. Thomas, 311.
Combe, Dr. A., Life of, 65.
Companions of my Solitude, 375.
Congregational Year-Book, 498.
Cooper, Elizabeth, obituary of, 384.
Copleston, Bishop, Life of, 661.
2 Cor. xii. 1, 295.
Courage, 401.
Cradock, Mr. Walter, 46.
Creeds, relics of the feudal age, 329.
Criminal statistics, 570.
Cromwell's, Dr., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 60.
Cropper's, Rev. J., Sermon on Religious Liberty, 60.
Crosskey's Sermon on Papal Aggression, 59.

Daughters' education, 30.
Dawes', Mr. (Dean of Hereford), school, 574.
De Wette, 249.
Death-bed, the, 33.
Defoe's History of the Plague, 31.
Despotism, the curse of, 93.
Dickens' David Copperfield, 218.
D'Israeli's, Mr., political religionism, 470.
Dixon's Life of Penn, 321.
Doctrinal dangers of Unitarians, 289.
Domestic Missions, 397.
Dramatic gossip, 394.
Dublin Review, 119.
Dudley double lecture, 447.

Eastern Unitarian Christian Society, 506.
Easton's Unitarianism, 694.
Eaton, Dr. Samuel, 517.
Eaton, Dr. Joseph, 518.
Edney, Miss, obituary of, 762.
Education in Ireland, 609, 679.
Edwards' Gangræna, 45, 419.
Elohim, 281.
Emans, Rev. Peter, 522.
Ἐπικαλοῦμαι, meaning of, 282.
Erbury, Wm., an early Unitarian, 46, 414.
Eulogists, 160.
Eustace-Street congregation, Dublin, 741.
Evans, Rev. Joseph, 520.
Evelyn's, John, History of Religion, 239.
Exhibition of Industry, religious whispers from, 330.
Eye, the, a proof of the wisdom of God, 674.
Ezekiel, Book of, 597.

Fable for literary men, 217.
Farindon and Owen, 247.
Fermoy, congregation at, 739.
Field, Rev. Wm., obituary of, 640.
Fiennes, Colonel, 44.
Fire of London, 417.
Fisher, T. E., obituary of, 384.
Fletcher, Thomas, Esq., obituary of, 125.
Fletcher, J. J., 192.
Follen's Sketches of Married Life, 496.
Forms of Prayer (Brook Street), 115.
Frederick, Duke of Saxony, 555,
Free inquiry, 716.
Freeman, Mrs., obituary of, 704.
Frisbie, Professor, 430.
Fullagar, Mr., on crime and education, 621.
Fuller's Rise and Progress of Dissent in Bristol, 43.

Γ., review of Life of Dr. A. Combe, 65—of Martineau and Atkinson, 193—of Dixon's Life of Penn, 321—of Tayler's Aspects of Faith, 449.
G., S., letter to the author of the Creed of Christendom, 705.
Galatians i. 17, 296,
Galton, Mr., of Birmingham, 105.
Gaskell's Unitarian Martyrs and Confessors, 303.
Gaskell, J. M., obituary of, 320.
General Fund, Dublin, 743.
Gentleman's Magazine, 246.
Gibbon and Walpole, 391.
Gilbert, Rev. T., case of, 378.
Godoy, the Prince of the Peace, 92.
Grace of the soul, 34.
Gray and Walpole, 386.
Green, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Greg's, Mr., Creed of Christendom, 402, 460, 559, 562, 705.

Grenville, Lord, 665.
Grundy, Rev. John, 532.
Grundy, Mrs., obituary of, 704.
Gunning, Bishop, 241.

H. A. on ministerial exchanges, 575.
H., E. H., religious whispers from the Exhibition of Industry, 331.
Haggai, book of, 478.
Hall, Robert, 30.
Hall, Mrs. S. C., Pilgrimages to English Shrines, 184.
Hammersley, Mr. Thomas, obituary of, 640.
Hampden, John, 185.
Harley, Edward, Esq., obituary of, 319.
Hawkes, Rev. W., 25.
Hawthorne's, Dr., Doctrine of Trinity, 556.
Hazard, Mrs., Bristol, 43, 44.
Hebrews i. 8, 99—xiii. 8, 649—xiii. 20, 649.
Heinfetter's, Mr., Literal Translations, 27, 366.
Henderson's, Professor, Lecture, 96.
Henn, Silas, 183, 498. Renounces Unitarianism, 696.
Higginson, Rev. Edward, 571. Sermon at Tamworth, 630.
Hincks', Rev. T., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 60.
History of the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, 517.
Holland, Rev. John, 520.
Holland's, Lord, Foreign Reminiscences, 86.
Hollis's Memoirs, 396.
Holme, Dr., letters to, from Dr. Parr, 21.
Horsey, Mrs., obituary of, 704.
Housewifery, spiritual, 108.
How to make Home Unhealthy, 110.
Hughes, Mrs. Mary, 32.
Hughes, Rev. Obadiah, 517.
Hume, David, 393.
Hutchinson, Mrs., 34.
Hutton, Rev. Dr., 533.
Hutton, Rev. Joseph, 744, 748.

Imitators, a hint to, 737.
Immanuel, the name, 514.
Independents, 240, 630.
Index Expurgatorius of Rome, 561.
Ireland, education in, 609, 679.
Ireton, General, character of, 247.
Isaiah, the book of, 267—ix. 6, 281—vii., viii., ix., 513.

Jackson, Rev. Arthur, 425, 426.
James, Rev. W., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 60.
Jaquel, Mr., 425.
Jecks, Mrs., obituary of, 126.
Jefferson's letter to Priestley, 211.
Jessey, Mr. Henry, 47.
Jewitt, Mrs., obituary of, 320.
Jews, the reformed, 749.
Job, book of, 161.
John x. 34—37, 98.
1 John v. 20, 99.
Johnson, John, of Lancaster, 701.
Jonah, book of, 479.
Judges, book of, 82.
Judgment-mongers, a fact for, 548.
Justitia, 555, 689.

K. on the bitter apples of Sodom, 577.
K., G., on the case of Mr. Gilbert, 378.
Kay, Joseph, on Social Condition and Education of the People, 145.
Kell, Rev. Robert, 528.
Kendal, Dr. Parrat, 23.
Kenrick, Rev. John, 122, 500. Address to students of Manchester New College, 480. Four Discourses on the Bible, 580.
Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, 757.
Knowles, John, 47.
Knutsford a Presbyterian station, 311.

Lafayette, 89.
Laing, Mr., on Social Condition of Europe, 145.
Laudism and Puseyism, 248.
Le Clerc and Bentley, 24.
Ledlie's, Dr., Lecture at Belfast, 238. His account of George Mathews, 641, 738.
Leeds Mercury, 603.
Leibnitz' model prayer, 235.
Lettis's Ears of Corn, 495.
Lewis XVI., 89.
Ley, Rev. John (note), 415.
Lines to a sleeping infant, 19. On London Dissenting ministers, 190. On reading some reviews, 411.
Lingard, Dr., obituary of, 640.
Little Lamb, 497.
Lloyd, George, Esq., 22.
Locke, John, 186, 343, 619.
Logos, doctrine of the, 282.
London, 34.
London District Unitarian Society, 382.
London University, 572.
Love, Christopher, 424.
Lynch, Mr., extracts from, 716.

M., S. F., lines by, 19.
Mackintosh, Sir James (note), 23, 673.
Maclellan's, Mr., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 60.
Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, 179.
Malachi, book of, 479.
M'Alister's, Mr., Lecture at Belfast, 238.
Maltby, Bishop, 171.
Manchester in rebellions of 1715 and 1745, 24.

Manchester, lectures at Cross-Street chapel, 123.
Manchester New College, 121, 480, 499, 637.
Manchester Sunday-School Association, 304.
Mardon, Mr., on biblical criticism and Unitarianism, 96.
Marie Antoinette, 90.
Marks' Sermons at the West-London Synagogue, 749.
Marriage, 32, 33.
Marriages, 64, 128, 256, 320, 447, 511, 576, 639, 762.
Marshall's Moral Aspects of the Exhibition, 565.
Martineau, Miss, on Cowkeeping, 113. On Man's Nature, 193.
Martineau's, Rev. James, Sermon, 615.
Mary, Queen of Scots, 31.
Mason, Rev. William, Correspondence with Walpole, 385.
Mathews, George, the religious swindler, 641, 738.
Matthew i. 23, 515—xxiv. 51, 647.
Meditations on a picture, 377.
Metaphors, 553.
Miall's, J. G., Footsteps of our Forefathers, 758.
Milton, John, 179.
Ministerial exchanges, 575.
Mirabeau, 87.
Miracles of the New Testament, 710.
M'Kee's address at Cleator, 566.
Montgomery's, Dr., Lecture on Christian Doctrine, 182.
Monthly Christian Spectator, 249.
Morning and Evening Meditations, 303.
Mossley, religious proceedings at, 251, 309, 314.
Muscutt's History of Church Laws in England, 549.

N. on Isaiah vii., viii., ix., 513. Notes on texts of Scripture, 646.
Nantwich, anniversary at, 61.
Napoleon, 31, 94.
National Public School Association, 316.
Nature, love of, 34.
Newman's, Father, Anglican Difficulties, 623.
Northampton, epitaph on the Marchioness of, 211.
North-Midland Meeting of Ministers, 442.
North-of-England Unitarian Association, 509.
Norton, Edward, Esq., obituary of, 448.
Notes and Queries, 190.
Nottingham, congregational history of, concluded, 516.

Oldbury double lecture, 638.
Osler, Mrs., obituary of, 640.
Owen, Dr. Charles, 700.
Owens College, Manchester, 63, 122, 253.

Paley's theory of morals, 345.
Papal aggression, 1, 9, 58, 115, 120, 182, 236, 312.
Parental affection, 32.
Parkes, John, Esq., obituary of, 704.
Parr, Dr., original letters of, 21.
Parson, the good, 274.
Penn, William, 321.
Percival, Dr. E. C., 22.
Perkins, Richard, obituary of, 125.
Persecution and its results, 378.
2 Peter i. 1, 99.
Petition of Irish Presbyterians, 746.
Philipps, Rev. Dr., 527.
Philips, Sir George, 25.
Phrenology, 78.
Plague of London, 472.
Popery, in Italy and England, 63. Pliancy of, 690.
Popular Historian, 497.
Porter, Anna Maria, thoughts by, 29.
Porter, Drummond, obituary of, 125.
Porter's, Rev. John, Lecture at Belfast, 237.
Porter's, Rev. J. Scott, Lecture at Belfast, 238.
Poynting's Temple of Education, 697.
Preacher of 1628, satirically described, 298.
Prejudice, 32, 34.
Presbyterian Classis of London (fourth), 417.
Preston, H. J., Esq., obituary of, 192.
Prideaux, Bishop, 413.
Priestley, Dr., 302. Original letters from and to, 100, 129, 202.
Priestley, Mrs., 139, 204.
Priestley, Henry, 203.
Priestley, Joseph, Jun., 102.
Prophets, on the, 35, 267, 478, 597.
Proverbs xx. 25, 647.
Provincial meeting, 435.
Psalm iv. 6, 646.

Quarterly Review, 117, 299.
Queen's Colleges, Ireland, 683.
Quillinan, Edward, Esq., obituary of, 512.
Quinn, Mr., 738.

R. on doctrinal dangers, 289. On Archbishop Whately's Introductory Lessons, 176.
R., H. C., on Unitarians and the Pope's Bull, 9.
R.'s, J., review of Kay and Laing on the Social Condition of the People, 145. Christianity in Ceylon, 258.
Rainold, anecdote of the brothers, 283.
Rees, Miss Sarah, obituary of, 762.

Reid, Mrs., obituary of, 319.
Religion, power of, 29.
Remonstrance of forty-six Presbyterian ministers, 1649, 423.
Remonstrances against Romish Corruptions, 432.
Robberds, Rev. J. G., 26. His Sermon on Papal Aggression, 59.
Robinson, Robert, Esq., obituary of, 319.
Romans ix. 6, 98—ix. 5, 281.
Royal Library, secret history of, 119.
Ruskin on the Construction of Sheepfolds, 431.
Russell, Thomas P., Esq., obituary of, 319.
Russell's, Mr., plan for relieving poor ministers, 689, 755.

Sadler's, Dr., Closet Prayers, 188. The Father seen in Christ, 289.
Saxby, Mrs., obituary of, 384.
Schleiermacher, 250.
Scientific Lecturer, 302.
Sedgwick, Professor, on Cambridge Studies, 389.
Servetus, 191, 300.
Sharpe, Mr., on the Prophets, 35, 267, 478, 597. On the book of Judges, 82. On Job, 161.
Sidney Herbert, a biographical sketch, 284.
Simpson, Rev. John, 522.
Sirr's Ceylon and the Cingalese, 257.
Sleep, lines composed in, 34.
Smale, Miss, obituary of, 704.
Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, 248.
Smith, Dr. Jeremiah, 26.
Smith, Dr. J. P., obituary of, 317.
Smith, Sydney, on classical education, 665.
Socinian boast, 190.
Socinianism in Bristol and Bath, 45.
Socinus, Faustus, 240.
Socrates, 118.
Solly, Hollis, obituary of, 640.
Sonnet, 35.
Southampton, Unitarianism at, 636, 703.
Southern Unitarian Fund Society, 380.
Southern Unitarian Society, 507.
St. Peter's church, Cornhill, 416.
Staël, Madame de, 31, 673.
Stanley, Bishop, 164.
Stars, the, 338.
Statesman, the, 377.
Stories for Summer Days, 702.
Stout, William, Autobiography of, 699.
Strand-Street congregation, Dublin, 744.
Strickland's, Miss, blunders, 246.
Suggestive Lessons—the Gospels, 433.
Sunday-School Association, 445.
Sunday-School Service Book, 631.
Symonds, Mr., 46, 419.

T., W., on our Lord's temptation, 212.
Talbot, Matthew, 603.
Talbot, John, 602, 605.
Tamworth, meeting at, 571.
Tayler, Rev. James, 528.
Tayler, Rev. J. J., 115, 437, 500, 502. His Aspects of Faith and Duty, 449. His Cleator Sermon, 702.
Taylor, Professor Edward, 63.
Temptation of our Lord in the wilderness, 212.
Tennant's, Sir J. E., Christianity in Ceylon, 257.
Testimony to the Truth of Jesus, 421.
Thackeray's Pendennis, 218.
Thom's, Rev. J. H., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 58.
Thompson, Mr. John, of Bristol, 52.
Thorough thinking, penalty of, 376.
1 Timothy iii. 16, 98.
Tipperary, congregation at, 740.
Titus ii. 13, 98.
Too much, 584.
Trinity, sculptured representations of the, 247.
Troublers, the world's, 298.
Turner's, W., Huntyng of the Romish Fox, 432.
Turner, Rev. W., and Bishop Stanley, 169, 173.
Turner, Rev. W., Jun., notes on the Acts, 294, 368.
Turner, Rev. H., 533.

Unitarian Association, British and Foreign, 443.
Unitarian Minister, on advertising, &c., 372.
Unitarian ministers' salaries, 554.
Unitarian sermon, reported by Dr. Vaughan, 563, 615.
Unitarians, non-resistance to the Pope's Bull, 8. Practical reforms amongst, 619. Language respecting Christ, 289. Church office of, 631.
Unitarianism, Vindication of, 275.
University Hall, 704.
Utilitarian philosophy, 346.

Vaughan, Benjamin, Esq., 138.
Vaughan, William, Esq., 139, 141.
Veritas on practical reforms, 619.
Verse-writing, 8.
Vestiges of the Creation, 339.
Vidler, Mr., on Domestic Missions, 397.
Virtuous friendship eternal, 33.
Voltaire, 32.
Vranken, Mrs., obituary of, 384.

W., E., review of Dr. Beard's Sermons, 38.
Wadsworth, Mrs., obituary of, 125.
Wakefield, congregational meeting at, 760.
Wakefield, Gilbert, 526.

Walker, Rev. George, 523.
Wallace, Rev. Charles, 440.
Walpole and Mason's Correspondence, 386.
Walters, Rev. William, 528.
Walton, Mrs., obituary of, 320.
Ware's American Unitarian Biography, 430.
Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society, 571.
Watson, Mr., friend of Priestley, 143.
Watts, Dr. Isaac, 187.
Weeks, Mr. John, of Bristol, 49.
Western Unitarian Christian Union, 315.
Western Unitarian Society, 759.
Westminster Review, 558.
West-Riding Tract Society, 441.
Whately, Archbishop, 673. Introductory Lessons, 176.
Whitefield and slavery in Georgia, 429.
Whitlock, Rev. N., 520.
Wickliffe's Wicket, 432.
Wicksteed, Rev. C., Sermon on Papal Aggression, 115.
Widows' Fund (Lancashire), 441.
Wilkinson, Mr. John, 100, 129.
Williams, Colonel, obituary of, 126.
Williams, Rev. Edward, 520.
Wilson, Rev. W., inscription for his tomb, 109.
Wiseman's, Cardinal, Appeal, 1.
Wither, the Puritan poet, 477.
Wood, W. R., Esq., 500.
Woods', Mr., tract on Immortality, 246.
Woods, Mrs., obituary of, 319.
Words of Christ, 158.
Wordsworth, Life of William, 351.
Working Man's Friend, 189.
Working Man's Home, 555.
Worthington, Dr., on the Supremacy of the Crown, 1.
Wreford, Dr., 109.
Wright, Thomas, obituary of, 448.
Wroth, Mr., of Bristol, 47.

Yates's Vindication of Unitarianism, 275. On the bitter apples of Sodom, 715.
Yates, Mrs. Ellen, obituary of, 124.
Yeamans, Mr., of Bristol, 43.
York, Duchess of, 91.
Young, James, Esq., obituary of, 383.

HK. 13. ct

C. Green, Printer, Hackney.